United Nations A/C.1/55/PV.22

General Assembly
Fifty-fifth session

Official Records

First Committee
22nd meeting
Wednesday, 25 October 2000, 3 p.m.
New York

Chairman: U Mya Than ..... (Myanmar)

The meeting was called to order at 3.35 p.m.

Agenda items 65 to 81

Action on all draft resolutions submitted under all items

The Chairman: As I mentioned on Monday, 23 October 2000, this afternoon the Committee will proceed to take action on draft resolutions that appear in informal working paper No. 1 in the following sequence: cluster 1, nuclear weapons, draft resolutions A/C.1/55/L.7, A/C.1/55/L.8, A/C.1/55/L.36, A/C.1/55/L.40/Rev.1 and A/C.1/55/L.45/Rev.1. In addition, if there is no objection, the Committee will take action on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.16, entitled "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East". I see no objection.

It was so decided.

The Chairman: In cluster 2, other weapons of mass destruction, we will take action on draft resolutions A/C.1/55/L.18 and A/C.1/55/L.20; and in cluster 4, conventional weapons, draft resolutions A/C.1/55/L.38/Rev.1 and A/C.1/55/L.50.

Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.16 is not yet ready to be taken up at this meeting so we will have to wait until delegations indicate their readiness to take action on it.

Before proceeding to take action on the draft resolutions I should like once again to review the procedure I outlined on Monday for this phase of the Committee's work. At the outset of each meeting, delegations will have an opportunity to introduce revised draft resolutions. I will then call upon those delegations wishing to make general statements or comments, other than in explanation of their position or vote, on the draft resolutions in a particular cluster.

Thereafter, delegations may proceed to explain their position or vote on the draft resolutions before a decision is taken.

After the Committee has taken a decision on a draft resolution, I will call upon those delegations wishing to explain their position or vote on the draft resolution on which a decision has just been taken.

Therefore, delegations will have two opportunities to explain votes or positions on a particular draft resolution: before and after a vote is taken. In accordance with the rules of procedure, sponsors of draft resolutions are not permitted to make statements in explanation of vote. They can make only general statements or comments on draft resolutions in particular clusters at the beginning of a meeting.

In order to avoid misunderstanding, I would again urge those delegations wishing to request a recorded vote on a particular draft resolution kindly to inform the Secretariat of their intention before the Committee begins its action on any individual cluster.

With regard to any deferment of action on any draft resolution, delegations should inform the Secretariat in advance. Every effort should be made, to

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room C-178. Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum.

00-70875 (E)

the extent possible, however, to refrain from resorting to a deferment of action on any draft resolution.

I hope these procedures are clear to all members of the Committee.

I call first on those delegations wishing to introduce revised draft resolutions.

Mr. Du Preez (South Africa): I wish first to introduce a technical proposal to draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.20, entitled "Measures to uphold the authority of the 1925 Geneva Protocol", which will be considered under cluster 2.

Since South Africa introduced this draft resolution in its capacity as Chairman of the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM), it has been brought to our attention that another State party to the Geneva Protocol withdrew its reservation in May this year. That information is contained in document A/55/115/Add.1. So as to give appropriate recognition to this important step, it is proposed that the word "one" in operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.20 be replaced by the word "two" and that the plural form of the word "State" be used. Operative 2, as amended, will then read:

> "*Notes with appreciation* the recent withdrawal of reservations by two States parties to the Geneva Protocol".

On behalf of the sponsors I again request that the draft resolution be adopted with maximum support.

I also wish to introduce a revised version of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.38, entitled "Illicit traffic in small arms and light weapons", circulated as A/C.1/55/L.38/Rev.1. That draft resolution will be considered under cluster 4.

So as to make it clear about what the Secretary-General is requested to consult on with regard to the role of the United Nations, the sponsors agree to revise the last part of operative paragraph 1 and to use the same language adopted without a vote at the fifty-third and fifty-fourth sessions. That language reads as follows:

> "and the role of the United Nations in collecting, collating, sharing and disseminating information on illicit trafficking in small arms and light weapons".

The sponsors agreed to make this change and hope that with this minor change the draft resolution can again be adopted without a vote as was the case, with resolutions at previous sessions.

Mr. Enkhsaikhan (Mongolia): I wish to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.40/Rev.1. Having consulted interested delegations after the first version of the draft resolution was circulated and introduced in the Committee, the following three changes have made.

In the sixth preambular paragraph there has been a request to clarify that the resolution mentioned is General Assembly resolution 53/77 D. The draft paragraph would thus read as follows:

> "*Welcoming* the measures taken to implement resolution 53/77 D at the national and international levels".

The second change concerns the seventh preambular paragraph. In it we clarify that the reference made in the present draft resolution is to the Final Document of the Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) and to paragraph 8 of the section concerning article VII of the Treaty. The revised preambular paragraph would thus read as follows:

> "*Recalling* that in the Final Document of the 2000 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, which was held at United Nations Headquarters from 24 April to 19 May 2000, the Conference welcomed, in paragraph 8 of the section concerning article VII of the Treaty, the declaration by Mongolia of its nuclear-weapon-free status and took note of the adoption by the Mongolian parliament of legislation defining and regulating that status".

The third change concerns operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.40. It has been suggested that reference to the Security Council should be made in the preambular part of the draft resolution rather than in its operative part. As to the wording, it was agreed that the new preambular paragraph, now the tenth preambular paragraph, would read as follows:

> "*Taking note also* of the fact that the joint statement has been transmitted to the Security Council by the five nuclear-weapon States".

With this addition, operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.40 is deleted. My delegation will refrain from commenting on the substance of this revision, which is self-explanatory. The revised draft resolution will thus have nine operative paragraphs rather than 10.

In conclusion, I should like to express once again my delegation's appreciation of the spirit of goodwill, understanding and cooperation that it found in the course of consultations on the drafting of the resolution. We believe that the draft resolution is non-controversial, constructive and forward-looking. Its adoption and implementation would allow Mongolia to contribute to the objectives of non-proliferation, greater predictability and stability in our region. Therefore, my delegation expresses the hope that the draft resolution will be adopted by consensus.

The Chairman: I now call on delegations wishing to make general statements or comments on draft resolutions contained in cluster 1, nuclear weapons.

Mr. Soutar (United Kingdom): I have asked for the floor briefly to outline the general approach of the United Kingdom to our consideration of the draft resolutions contained in cluster 1, on nuclear disarmament.

When introducing the first of the draft resolutions on which you, Mr. Chairman, propose to ask the Committee to take action today, namely, A/C.1/55/L.7, entitled "2000 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons", the representative of Algeria referred to the remarkable achievements of that Conference. I quote:

> "The balanced review of the implementation of the Treaty's provisions since the Treaty's indefinite extension in 1995 and the agreement on realistic and practical steps to further advance the process of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation and to strengthen cooperation in the peaceful application of nuclear energy, as well as the agreement on improving the effectiveness of the strengthened review process for the Treaty, are, indeed, remarkable achievements." (*A/C.1/55/PV.15, p. 3*)

These are indeed remarkable achievements, and I should like to pay tribute here to the outstanding personal contribution that Ambassador Baali made to that outcome.

The Final Document of the 2000 Review Conference sets out, in a balanced way, a number of practical steps for the achievement of the global elimination of nuclear weapons. The United Kingdom stands by all of these undertakings. We also believe that it is right that the General Assembly should welcome the outcome of the Conference, as proposed in draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.7.

A number of other draft resolutions have been placed before the Committee which, it is claimed by their authors, seek to reflect the outcome of the Conference by incorporating language from the Final Document to update resolutions from earlier years. While respecting the intentions of the authors of such draft resolutions, I must sound a note of caution. Those of us here present who were also present at the Review Conference recall only too vividly that the Final Document emerged as the product of laboriously achieved compromise. Those compromises risk being undermined if the language of the Final Document is quoted from selectively or is subjected to interpretations which its authors had not agreed in the course of the Review Conference itself. For that reason, the United Kingdom will determine its position on the other nuclear disarmament draft resolutions before the Committee after an assessment of how faithfully they reflect the letter and the spirit of the Final Document.

Mr. Benítez Verson (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): My delegation has asked for the floor to make a general statement under this cluster, the aim being once again to place on record where we stand on the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). We deemed it appropriate to make this general statement to avoid to the extent possible the need to offer repeated explanations of vote when the Committee takes decisions on the draft resolutions and separate paragraphs included in this cluster that refer in one way or another to the Non-Proliferation Treaty. However, we reserve the right to make additional explanations on specific votes when specific draft resolutions or paragraphs referring to the NPT come up, if we deem it appropriate to do so.

The provisions of the Non-Proliferation Treaty are essentially discriminatory and selective because they legitimize the possession of nuclear weapons by a

select club of countries. The nuclear Powers legitimized by the NPT are not even obliged to submit their installations and nuclear arsenals to international safeguards. Neither is there any prohibition on the vertical proliferation of nuclear weapons, which makes it possible for the nuclear Powers recognized as such in the Treaty to constantly develop them qualitatively. Those are the reasons why thus far Cuba has not signed or ratified the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. Our country will continue, in a totally transparent way, to develop its nuclear programme for peaceful purposes and will keep working tirelessly for nuclear disarmament and the total elimination of nuclear weapons.

Though it is not a party to the NPT, all of Cuba's nuclear installations are now under International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards arrangements, with which we are strictly abiding. Cuba's decision to participate as an observer at the sixth Review Conference of the NPT once again demonstrated the interest and serious-mindedness with which our country has been following all issues involving disarmament and non-proliferation.

We have taken due note of the outcome of the sixth Conference and hope and expect that the nuclear-weapon States will live up to the specific commitments they have assumed thereunder. Some States — fortunately, the minority — have expressed a great deal of optimism about the results of the sixth Review Conference. Cuba fully respects the right of each country to make its own evaluations. As we see it, there are no grounds for complacency when we see the continued absence of deadlines to get rid of the remaining 35,000 nuclear weapons that today threaten us all.

For these reasons, Cuba will not vote in favour of specific draft resolutions and separate paragraphs in this cluster that refer to the Non-Proliferation Treaty and do not accord with our positions.

Mr. Westdal (Canada): I take the floor to speak in support of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.7, entitled "2000 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons". I congratulate Algerian Ambassador Baali on his highly skilful presidency and leadership of the memorably successful Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) Review Conference, which this spring, here in this house, produced a landmark consensus declaration, an unprecedented, unequivocal undertaking, and an impressive programme of multilateral, bilateral and nuclear-weapon State work towards the fulfilment of this vital Treaty. Widespread scepticism was confounded, the 1995 promise of permanence with accountability was kept, and new hope was born.

I recognize that some States here are not parties to the NPT. I nonetheless believe that the Treaty serves their interests as well, for it serves global security interests we all share. I urge them to recognize this common ground and to join us all, every one, in its defence.

Mr. Eslamizad (Islamic Republic of Iran): I have asked for the floor to make some very brief comments on the draft resolution entitled "Mongolia's international security and nuclear-weapon-free status", document A/C.1/55/L.40/Rev.1. The Islamic Republic of Iran, as a matter of principle, supports and encourages the initiation of practical measures towards the universal eradication of nuclear weapons. In this context, the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones is an effective measure to realize such goals. The draft resolutions submitted by Mongolia since 1998 on recognizing and according to that country the status of a country free from nuclear weapons, in our view, is an initiative that deserves support. These draft resolutions, fortunately, have received broad support from the international community. We note with satisfaction that following the adoption of such resolutions efforts were made to implement them. The draft resolution again this year is a reiteration of the principled position adopted by the General Assembly to achieve a nuclear-weapon-free world, and we are confident that the implementation of this draft resolution would also prepare the ground for strengthening security and stability in the region.

The Chairman: I call now on those delegations wishing to explain their vote or position on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.7 before a decision is taken.

Mr. Akram (Pakistan): My delegation would like to say a few words in explanation of our vote on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.7, on the results of the Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). We have already expressed the view that the sense of optimism that we have witnessed in the Committee during the present session is perhaps due in large measure to the

consensus achieved at the NPT Review Conference. We have also felicitated the President of the Conference, Ambassador Baali of Algeria, and others involved, for their admirable efforts to achieve this consensus, although perhaps if certain other States had been present at the Conference the nature of that consensus may have been somewhat different.

Pakistan also had an opportunity on 23 October — that is, last week — to express its views on some of the provisions of the NPT Conference's consensus that are inconsistent with Pakistan's national security interests and policies and are thus unacceptable to it. I will not belabour the point by repeating those considerations, which are already in the record. For that reason, Pakistan cannot agree to the provision in draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.7 which welcomes the results of the NPT Conference. My delegation will therefore be obliged to abstain in the voting on the draft resolution.

The Chairman: If no other delegation wishes to speak, the Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.7.

A recorded vote has been requested.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Lin Kuo-chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.7, entitled "2000 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons", was introduced by the representative of Algeria at the Committee's 15th meeting, on 16 October 2000.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Cape Verde, India

Abstaining:

Cuba, Israel, Pakistan

Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.7 was adopted by 141 votes to 2, with 3 abstentions.

[*Subsequently, the delegations of Cape Verde and Haiti informed the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour.*]

The Chairman: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes or positions on the draft resolution just adopted.

Mr. Mukul (India): My delegation has requested the floor to explain its position after the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.7, entitled "2000 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons". My delegation's views on the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) are well known. The NPT remains both discriminatory and ineffective. It seeks to perpetuate a discriminatory non-proliferation regime while turning a blind eye to reality. Further, the NPT has also proved to be inadequate and ineffective. The

proliferation of nuclear weapons and delivery systems has continued unabated, while article VI remains unimplemented. In fact, the NPT nuclear-weapon States have either been active collaborators in, or silent spectators to, continuing proliferation, including exports of nuclear-weapon-related components and technologies.

The draft resolution seeks to welcome the Final Document of the 2000 NPT Review Conference, which makes a number of completely unacceptable and totally unwarranted references to my country, a non-party to the discriminatory NPT. My delegation rejects those references unequivocally in their entirety. Moreover, the optimism, even euphoria, witnessed in some quarters at the very outcome of the 2000 NPT Review Conference has proved to be short-lived and hollow. With no progress on the ground, as witnessed in the Conference on Disarmament, where all attempts at even commencing any substantive and meaningful negotiations on nuclear disarmament have proved futile, my delegation obviously cannot be a party to this and has therefore cast a negative vote on the draft resolution.

Mr. Thapa (Nepal): My delegation wishes to take the floor in explanation of its vote after the voting on the draft resolution entitled "2000 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons", document A/C.1/55/L.7. At a time when the nuclear-disarmament agenda needs to be pursued with all seriousness, the adoption of the draft resolution entitled "2000 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons" by a majority of member States only vindicates the position of my delegation which has accorded the highest priority to the issue of nuclear disarmament. May I recall that our representative, while speaking during the general debate in the Committee, also emphasized the importance my delegation has been giving to this issue. The outcome of the Review Conference, especially the unequivocal commitment of the nuclear-weapon States to eliminate their nuclear arsenals, deserves to be welcomed. We only hope that this commitment made in good faith during the Review Conference of the NPT will be translated into action sooner rather than later, as a large majority of the members of this Committee place such emphasis on this particular achievement of the Review Conference.

The Chairman: If no delegations wish to explain their vote or position before a decision is taken on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.8, the Committee will now proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.8.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Lin Kuo-chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.8, entitled "Consolidation of the regime established by the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America and the Caribbean (Treaty of Tlatelolco)", was introduced by the representative of Mexico at the Committee's 17th meeting, on 18 October 2000. The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.8 are listed in the draft resolution itself.

The Chairman: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.8 have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.8 was adopted.

The Chairman: If no representatives wish to explain their position on the draft resolution just adopted, the Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.36.

If no representatives wish to explain their position or vote before a decision is taken, the Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.36.

A recorded vote has been requested.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Lin Kuo-chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.36, entitled "Conclusion of effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons", was introduced by the representative of Pakistan at the Committee's 19th meeting, on 20 October 2000. The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.36 are listed in the draft resolution itself and in document A/C.1/55/INF.2.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh,

Barbados, Belarus, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Andorra, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Lesotho, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tonga, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.36 was adopted by 97 votes to none, with 50 abstentions.

[*Subsequently, the delegation of Haiti informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.*]

The Chairman: I now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes or positions on the draft resolution just adopted.

Mr. Suh Dae-won (Republic of Korea): My delegation wishes to explain its abstention in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.36. We agreed to the need for negative security assurances at the sixth Review Conference of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). In our view, the primary issue here centres on to whom and in what form security assurances will be given. My delegation has upheld the principle that non-nuclear-weapon States parties to the NPT that fully comply with its provisions, in particular those contained in articles II and III of the NPT, have a legitimate right to receive assurances from nuclear-weapon States that the latter will not use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against the former. Likewise, nuclear-weapon States have a corresponding obligation to provide such assurances to non-nuclear-weapon States, but only to those in compliance with the NPT provisions. These mutual responsibilities, conditional for all States parties to the NPT, will doubtless contribute to strengthening the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons.

On the issue of form, my delegation has considered the options expressed by those in favour of a single international instrument and those in favour of bilateral, regional or other approaches. While the Republic of Korea sees the need to address this issue more closely, it holds the position that if principles that address these aforementioned mutual responsibilities are firmly established, it could be flexible on the issue of form. As we do not feel that this draft resolution adequately reflects these concerns, my delegation abstained in the voting.

Mr. Mukul (India): My delegation wishes to explain its position on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.36, entitled "Conclusion of effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons".

India has consistently maintained that the only credible guarantee against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons lies in their total elimination. Until this objective is achieved, as an interim measure and as one that complements other measures to reduce nuclear dangers, including de-alerting, we believe that there exists an obligation on the part of States possessing nuclear weapons to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use of such weapons. This obligation should be of an internationally binding character, clear, credible, universal and without discrimination.

No delegation is opposed to the establishment of an ad hoc committee on negative security assurances in the Conference on Disarmament. Such an ad hoc committee would be an essential element in any programme of work in the Conference on Disarmament next year that reflects the priorities and interests of all delegations.

For its part, and conscious of its responsibilities as a nuclear-weapon State, India has stated that it will not be the first to use nuclear weapons against nuclear-weapon States and that it remains willing to strengthen this undertaking by entering into arrangements on "no first use", or multilateral negotiations on global "no first use".

With our having stated that we will not be the first to use nuclear weapons, there remains no basis for their use against countries which do not have nuclear weapons. India respects the choice exercised by non-nuclear-weapon States in establishing nuclear-weapon-free zones on the basis of arrangements freely arrived at among the States of the region concerned and remains willing to convert this commitment into a legal obligation.

Mr. Luck (Australia): I have asked for the floor to provide an explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.36. Australia considers that pending the elimination of nuclear weapons, consistent with article VI of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), negative security assurances are an essential reinforcing element underpinning the international non-proliferation and disarmament regime. Australia considers that those countries that are non-nuclear-weapon States parties to the NPT, that have renounced the nuclear-weapons option and that are in full compliance with their NPT obligations have a legitimate claim to credible, comprehensive and effective negative security assurances from the five nuclear-weapon States. Negative security assurances are also an important inducement for the few States still outside the NPT to accede to the Treaty, and Australia continues to hold the view that only States willing to assure the security of others by becoming parties to the NPT should benefit from negative security assurances.

Regrettably, the failure of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.36 to give due primacy to the particular claims and interests of States parties to the NPT in this regard prevented Australia from supporting the draft resolution.

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.40/Rev.1. If no representatives wish to explain their position or vote before a decision is taken, the Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.40/Rev.1.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Lin Kuo-chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.40/Rev.1, entitled "Mongolia's international security and nuclear-weapon-free status", was introduced by the representative of Mongolia at the Committee's 18th meeting, on 19 October 2000.

The Chairman: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.40/Rev.1 have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.40/Rev.1 was adopted.

The Chairman: I now call upon those representatives who wish to explain their position on the draft resolution just adopted.

Mr. King (United States of America): The United States is pleased that draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.40/Rev.1, entitled "Mongolia's international security and nuclear-weapon-free status", has been adopted without a vote. We would simply like to note that the United States will continue to cooperate in the implementation of this draft resolution, as it did for its predecessor resolution, 53/77 D. We would also hope that other United Nations Members, and the appropriate United Nations bodies, would continue to lend their cooperation and support, as necessary, in this same endeavour.

Mr. Mukul (India): My delegation has joined in the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.40/Rev.1, entitled "Mongolia's international security and nuclear-weapon-free status", introduced by Mongolia and adopted without a vote.

Mongolia, a country with which India has extremely close and friendly relations, enjoys a special and unique position, resulting in its quest for nuclear-weapon-free status. In the pursuit of that objective,

Mongolia has taken a number of concrete measures, including the adoption of national domestic legislation. We acknowledge with appreciation and convey support for Mongolia's statement, dated 6 October 2000, reaffirming its readiness to cooperate with all Member States of the United Nations and relevant United Nations bodies in enhancing the effectiveness and strengthening the credibility of its nuclear-weapon-free status. India fully respects the choice made by Mongolia and extends its cooperation, support and commitment to Mongolia's nuclear-weapon-free status. We believe that in order to be effective and credible, security assurances should be unambiguous and internationally binding. We therefore also call upon all the Member States of the United Nations, particularly those that possess nuclear weapons, to respond positively for the full realization and strengthening of Mongolia's nuclear-weapon-free status.

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.45/Rev.1.

If no representatives wish to explain their position or vote before a decision is taken, the Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.45/Rev.1.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Lin Kuo-chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.45/Rev.1, entitled "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Central Asia", was introduced by the representative of Uzbekistan at the Committee's 20th meeting, on 20 October 2000. The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.45/Rev.1 are listed in the draft resolution itself.

The Chairman: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.45/Rev.1 have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.45/Rev.1 was adopted.

The Chairman: I now call upon those representatives who wish to explain their position on the draft resolution just adopted.

Mr. Mukul (India): My delegation has joined the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.45/Rev.1, entitled "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Central Asia", which has just been adopted without a vote. It is noteworthy that the proposal for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Central Asia is supported by all the States of the region, in conformity with the requirement of arrangements freely arrived at among the States of the region concerned.

We are particularly pleased that the efforts of the Central Asian States, with which India historically enjoys close and friendly ties, are getting the international support that the initiative deserves. India fully respects the choice made by the Central Asian States and is prepared to extend all possible support and commitment in response to the expressed need for the early realization of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Central Asia.

Mr. Thapa (Nepal): My delegation expresses its happiness at the adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.45/Rev.1, entitled "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Central Asia", for the reason that the establishment of such nuclear-weapon-free zones is an effective confidence-building measure.

The Chairman: We now come to cluster 2. If no delegations wish to make general statements on draft resolutions contained in cluster 2, other weapons of mass destruction, the Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.18. I call first on those representatives wishing to explain their position or vote before a decision is taken.

Mr. Khairat (Egypt): The delegation of Egypt wishes to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.18 before action is taken on the draft resolution.

Egypt has traditionally supported all measures leading to the promotion of international and regional stability and has always committed itself to engage in constructive action in the fulfilment of that obligation. It is in that spirit that we cannot but sympathize with the general thrust of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.18, as it addresses a good instrument which aims at prohibiting a whole category of weapons of mass destruction, namely, chemical weapons, thus giving the Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC) effective impact in the field of disarmament, as opposed to non-proliferation.

Nevertheless, Egypt would like to stress once again its well-known position vis-à-vis the Convention

and its implications in the Middle East region. Our commitment, explained vividly, to the prohibition of chemical weapons and all weapons of mass destruction is best exemplified by President Mubarak's 1990 initiative on the establishment in the Middle East of a zone free from all weapons of mass destruction, underscoring the following elements: first, a total prohibition in the Middle East of all weapons of mass destruction without exception, be they nuclear, chemical or biological; and, secondly, that all States in the region should make a solemn declaration, without exception, of reciprocal commitment and obligation in this regard.

That prompted the Security Council to support our initiative, as mentioned in its resolution 687 (1991) and in the Security Council statement of 1992. In July 1991 Foreign Minister Amre Moussa, in his letter addressed to the Secretary-General, explained that priority must be given to freeing the Middle East of all weapons of mass destruction and to increasing the security of the States of the region with a lower level of armament, as well as to the realization of equal and reciprocal security for all States in the region, not through a qualitative edge, nor through military superiority, but through dialogue, negotiations and a deep commitment to peace, equality and security for all.

Although Egypt participated actively in the long and arduous negotiations which took place in the Conference on Disarmament and which led to the elaboration of the provisions of the Chemical Weapons Convention, its position has been voiced since day one, at the time of the Convention's opening for signature in January 1993 at the Paris Conference. Indeed, our position emanates from and is firmly based on our regional considerations and concerns. For a long time now, Israel has been repeatedly stating on different occasions and in various forums that the application of this Convention should include all States in the Middle East region within a mutually accepted verification mechanism. In all frankness, I have to admit that, for once, we are not at odds with what Israel here seems to advocate or state as its aspirations. The Government of Egypt shares that view. However, it is the wider spectrum that is important, not limited only to chemical weapons or to biological weapons, but including both together, along with the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), to which all States of the Middle East are parties with the exception of Israel, which continues to refuse to join the Treaty or to place all its nuclear facilities under International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) full-scope safeguards.

Despite all these considerations, my delegation did not request a recorded vote on this draft resolution. However, we do not consider ourselves to be part of any consensus decision that will be taken on this draft resolution today and would like to register our reservation on the content and letter of the operative paragraphs in the draft.

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.18.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Lin Kuo-chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.18, entitled "Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on Their Destruction", was introduced by the representative of Poland at the Committee's 15th meeting, on 16 October 2000. The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.18 are listed in the draft resolution itself.

The Chairman: The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I will take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.18 was adopted.

The Chairman: I call now on those delegations wishing to explain their positions on the draft resolution just adopted.

Mr. Bar (Israel): Israel once again joined the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.18, entitled "Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on Their Destruction". Israel signed the Convention and participated actively in the Preparatory Commission in order to shape the Convention into a workable mechanism. By signing the Convention Israel reflected its moral vision and commitment to a world free of chemical weapons. We reaffirm that commitment. On signing the Convention in January 1993, Israel expressed its hope that other countries in the region would soon follow suit. Among those are countries that are known for their use of

chemical weapons in the past and are believed to continuously strive to improve their chemical capabilities. Unfortunately, none of those countries has either signed or ratified the Convention, or expressed any intention to do so. Therefore, Israel believes that the issue of chemical disarmament, as well as the issue of other weapons of mass destruction, should be dealt with within the regional context.

The reason Israel has not yet ratified the Convention relates to Israel's unique geopolitical environment. At the signing ceremony of the CWC in 1993, Israel made it clear that it would seek to ratify the Convention subject, inter alia, to regional security concerns. These considerations remain no less valid today, as these concerns have not diminished but have only increased.

The fact that Israel joined the consensus on this draft resolution must not be construed as prejudging the outcome of Israel's decision on the ratification of the CWC. Once again Israel reaffirms its view that positive changes in the security climate in the Middle East will be a major consideration for Israel regarding the ratification issue.

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.20. If no representatives wish to explain their position or vote before a decision is taken, the Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.20.

A recorded vote has been requested.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Lin Kuo-chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.20, entitled "Measures to uphold the authority of the 1925 Geneva Protocol", was introduced by the representative of South Africa at the Committee's 18th meeting, on 19 October 2000, on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries. This draft resolution has been orally revised by the representative of South Africa. In operative paragraph 2 the words "one State party" are replaced by the words "two States parties". Accordingly, at the end of the footnote at the bottom of the page, the words "and addendum 1" are added.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Israel, Micronesia (Federated States of), Republic of Korea, United States of America

Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.20, as orally revised, was adopted by 144 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.

The Chairman: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes or positions on the draft resolution just adopted.

Mr. Eslamizad (Islamic Republic of Iran): The strong support of this body for the adoption of this draft resolution is the manifestation of the will of the international community to strengthen the ban against the use of biological and chemical weapons. The 1925 Geneva Protocol is an important and essential instrument which has contributed to the prohibition of chemical and biological weapons. However, some States parties to this Protocol, out of security considerations, made reservations to the Protocol, which opens up the possibility that those States could use such weapons if they were to be attacked with chemical and biological weapons. But the international situation is changing. After many years of negotiations the Biological Weapons Convention (BWC) was concluded in 1972, banning the use of such weapons under any circumstances. The Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC), which was also the product of more than 25 years of negotiations, also prohibits the use of chemical weapons under any circumstances. That means that under existing legal instruments the use of chemical and biological weapons is banned even in cases of reciprocity. The international community today cannot afford to observe that those weapons could be used under any circumstance or justification.

This situation makes obsolete the reservations to the 1925 Geneva Protocol and not commensurate with the trend of the disarmament process to strengthen such a ban on the use of weapons of mass destruction, including chemical and biological weapons. The General Assembly resolution asking for the waiving of reservations to the 1925 Geneva Protocol, therefore, is both timely and relevant. We are encouraged to see that the resolution is now widely and increasingly supported. We are particularly grateful to the Governments of Canada, and, very recently, Estonia, which have removed their reservations to the Protocol in order to strengthen and uphold its provisions. My delegation is also grateful to all other countries that have supported this draft resolution, and we hope that in the near future, with the promotion of our common understanding, the draft resolution will be adopted without a vote. Our positive optimism is, of course, based on the records that show that votes other than positive votes have been decreasing since 1996.

The Chairman: We now come to cluster 4, conventional weapons. I call on delegations wishing to make general statements on draft resolutions contained in cluster 4.

Mr. Rowe (Sierra Leone): I should like to make some general remarks on cluster 4.

As a country that has been devastated by the use, including the indiscriminate use, of small arms and light weapons, and a country in which these weapons continue to pose a serious threat to peace and security — not only to Sierra Leone but also to the West African subregion — my delegation attaches great importance to the issues contained in the draft resolutions under cluster 4, namely, conventional weapons.

Sierra Leone does not manufacture these weapons and is not in a position to stop the flow of these weapons into its own territory or into the West African subregion. At the same time, Sierra Leone does not use, and has never used, its territory as a conduit for the illicit flow of these arms. Therefore, we can only rely on the efforts of the United Nations and the international community as a whole to take effective action to curb the illicit trafficking in small arms.

We, for our part, have scrupulously observed the provisions of the regional mechanism in our area, namely the Economic Community of West African States moratorium for controlling the importation, exportation and manufacture of small arms. It is our hope that other States will respect the existing arms control mechanisms or regimes, especially those established by the Security Council, pertaining to the West African subregion.

More importantly, we hope that support for the draft resolutions now before the Committee under cluster 4, conventional weapons, will provide an incentive — indeed, a new momentum — in the pursuit of peace, stability and good-neighbourliness in all those areas where small arms pose a threat, including our own area, the West African region. We also hope that it will also provide an incentive for support for disarmament, demobilization and rehabilitation programmes not only in Sierra Leone but also in other areas of our African continent.

Finally, my delegation looks forward to the outcome of the 2001 United Nations Conference on the

Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects.

The Chairman: If no other delegation wishes to make a general statement on draft resolutions in cluster 4, the Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.38/Rev.1.

If no delegations wish to explain their position or vote before a decision is taken, the Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.38/Rev.1.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Lin Kuo-chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.38/Rev.1, entitled "Illicit traffic in small arms and light weapons", was introduced by the representative of South Africa at the Committee's 16th meeting, on 17 October 2000. The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.38/Rev.1 are listed in the draft resolution itself and in document A/C.1/55/INF.2. In addition, the following countries have become sponsors of the draft resolution: Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Slovakia and Liechtenstein.

The Chairman: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.38/Rev.1 have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.38/Rev.1 was adopted.

The Chairman: If no representatives wish to explain their position on the draft resolution just adopted, we shall proceed to the next draft resolution. I have just been informed by the Secretary that draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.44 is not ready for action because the report on the programme budget implications is needed. That draft resolution will be taken up later.

We will now, therefore, proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.50. If no representatives wish to explain their position or vote before a decision is taken, the Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.50.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Lin Kuo-chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.50, entitled "Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects", was introduced by the representative of Sweden at the Committee's 19th meeting, on 20 October 2000. The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.50 are listed in the draft resolution itself and in document A/C.1/55/INF.2. In addition, Togo has also become a sponsor of the draft resolution.

The Chairman: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.50 have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.50 was adopted.

The Chairman: If no representatives wish to explain their position on the draft resolution just adopted, we have completed consideration of and action on draft resolutions contained in informal working paper No.1.

I now call on the Secretary of the Committee to explain informal working paper No. 2/Rev.1.

Mr. Lin Kuo-chung (Secretary of the Committee): For tomorrow's programme and action, informal working paper No. 2/Rev.1 has already been distributed. However, in cluster 1, nuclear weapons, there is a mistake in the title of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.16. The title should be "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East".

The meeting rose at 5.05 p.m.

United Nations A/C.1/55/PV.23

General Assembly
Fifty-fifth session

Official Records

First Committee
23rd meeting
Thursday, 26 October 2000, 10.30 a.m.
New York

Chairman: U Mya Than ..... (Myanmar)

The meeting was called to order at 10.45 a.m.

Agenda items 65 to 81 *(continued)*

Action on all draft resolutions submitted under all items

The Chairman: As I mentioned at the Committee's meeting yesterday, Wednesday, 25 October 2000, today the Committee will continue to take action on the draft resolutions that appear in informal working paper No.2/Rev.1 following the sequence indicated: cluster 1, nuclear weapons, A/C.1/55/L.16; cluster 4, conventional weapons, A/C.1/55/L.44; cluster 5, regional disarmament and security, A/C.1/55/L.35; cluster 6, confidence-building measures, including transparency in armaments, A/C.1/55/L.12; cluster 7, disarmament machinery, A/C.1/55/L.3/Rev.1, A/C.1/55/L.5, A/C.1/55/L.9, A/C.1/55/L.13, A/C.1/55/L.14/Rev.2, A/C.1/55/L.17, A/C.1/55/L.23, A/C.1/55/L.24, A/C.1/55/L.26 and A/C.1/55/L.33.

Before the Committee proceeds with the introduction of revised draft resolutions, I should like to call on the Under-Secretary-General for Disarmament Affairs, Mr. Jayantha Dhanapala, to make a brief statement.

Mr. Dhanapala (Under-Secretary-General for Disarmament Affairs): The Department for Disarmament Affairs from time to time receives from the public numerous petitions addressed to the United Nations appealing for international peace, security and disarmament. There is no reporting mechanism within the United Nations disarmament machinery. I believe, therefore, it is my responsibility to inform the Committee of appeals addressed to it from the world community of civil society.

Within the framework of observing United Nations Disarmament Week, over 50 members of the Japan Council against Atomic and Hydrogen Bombs, Gensuikyo, travelled across the Pacific Ocean to New York to present to the United Nations the appeal from Hiroshima and Nagasaki for a total ban on and elimination of nuclear weapons, together with more than 100 million signatures they had collected for that appeal. For the information of delegations, copies of the appeal have been placed at the back of the room.

The Chairman: I call now on those delegations wishing to introduce revised draft resolutions.

Mr. Ngoh Ngoh (Cameroon) (*spoke in French*): My delegation has taken the floor in order to introduce an amendment to draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.34, entitled "Regional disarmament", which is contained in document A/C.1/55/L.53. The amendment is intended to enhance the effectiveness of the draft resolution by requesting all States to communicate to the Secretary-General of the United Nations information on regional disarmament efforts and initiatives and the establishment of confidence-building measures carried out by regional and subregional organizations. The idea is to give the Committee better information about these efforts and to facilitate coordination by the Secretary-General, as well as to facilitate the implementation and

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room C-178. Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum.

00-71179 (E)

strengthening of these initiatives through appropriate assistance from the Secretary-General to the regional and subregional organizations.

Regional disarmament and world disarmament are complementary. Any new impetus given to regional disarmament can only have a beneficial effect on world disarmament and thus on peace and international security. The efforts deployed in this area by regional and subregional organizations therefore deserve to be better known and supported by the international community. In Africa the Southern African Development Community and the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) stand out in this area. ECOWAS in particular established a Moratorium on the Importation, Exportation and Manufacture of Small Arms and Light Weapons. This year the Economic Community of Central African States adopted the protocol instituting the Council for Peace and Security in Central Africa. Other deserving efforts are also being made, in particular with regard to the implementation in Latin America of the Inter-American Convention Against the Illicit Manufacturing of and Trafficking in Firearms, Ammunition, Explosives and Other Related Materials. As the regional seminar organized in Jakarta on 3 and 4 May 2000 demonstrated, other efforts have also been carried out. We could also mention the efforts of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe and others.

Finally, I should like to point out that the draft amendment that we have the honour to present is very much in line with the objectives of cluster 5, regional disarmament, for the medium term, from 2002 to 2005, which the Committee considered last week. Consequently, I should like to call on all delegations to support the draft amendment and the draft resolution as a whole, so that they can be adopted by consensus.

The Chairman: If no delegations wish to make general statements or comments on draft resolutions contained in cluster 1, nuclear weapons, the Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.16.

If no representatives wish to explain their position or vote before a decision is taken, the Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.16.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Lin Kuo-chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.16, entitled "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East", was introduced by the representative of Egypt at the Committee's 19th meeting, on 20 October 2000.

The Chairman: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.16 have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.16 was adopted.

The Chairman: I now call upon those representatives who wish to explain their position on the draft resolution just adopted.

Mr. Bar (Israel): Israel joined the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.16, entitled "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East", as it has done in the case of corresponding draft resolutions for the past 20 years, notwithstanding substantive and important reservations regarding certain elements in the draft resolution.

The policy of Israel has always maintained that the nuclear issue, as well as all regional security issues, conventional and unconventional, should be dealt with in the full context of the peace process. Israel supports the eventual establishment of a mutual, verifiable nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East that should also be free of chemical and biological weapons, and their means of delivery. Israel believes that the political realities in the Middle East mandate a practical, step-by-step approach. We should begin with modest confidence-building measures, followed by the establishment of peaceful relations and reaching reconciliation, and possibly complemented by conventional and non-conventional arms control measures. This process could eventually lead to more ambitious goals, such as establishing a zone free of all weapons of mass destruction.

As the international community has recognized, the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone should be based on arrangements freely arrived at by all States of the region concerned. Israel believes that such a zone can be established only through direct negotiation between the States of the region after they recognize each other and have established full, peaceful and diplomatic relations between them. It cannot be

established other than by the parties themselves, nor can it be established in a situation where some States maintain that they are in a state of war with each other and refuse in principle to maintain peaceful relations. In this context, it should be recalled that in the Middle East, unlike in other regions in the world where nuclear-weapon-free zones have been established, there is a continuing threat against the very existence of one State in the region, Israel. This has a critical impact on the region's ability to establish such a zone.

The consensus we have maintained over the years reflects a delicate compromise that all the parties have managed to live with. This year a genuine effort was made by both Egypt and Israel to introduce new agreed language into the draft resolution. Eventually it was agreed to present the same language as in previous years. I can only speak on behalf of Israel and say that my delegation demonstrated a constructive approach during these deliberations. We feel that is a good example of how confidence could be built. Moreover, it is a key element for preserving consensus in the future.

The Chairman: We now come to cluster 4. If no delegations wish to make general comments or statements on draft resolutions contained in cluster 4, conventional weapons, the Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.44. I call first on those representatives wishing to explain their position or vote before a decision is taken.

Mr. Khairat (Egypt): The delegation of Egypt has asked for the floor for the purpose of presenting an explanation of its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.44, entitled "Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on Their Destruction".

At the outset we wish to highlight that Egypt is considered to be one of the countries most affected by landmines and unexploded ordnance. The continued existence of more than 22 million landmines scattered over 288,000 acres of Egyptian territory causes serious concern to the Government of Egypt. Although the Egyptian Government supports the humanitarian objective that inspired the conception of the Ottawa Convention, it sees the Convention as failing to address some pressing concerns. These concerns are summarized in the following two points.

First, the Convention does not provide a binding legal framework that recognizes the responsibility of the countries that plant and deploy landmines in the territories of other States and hence does not provide for commitments by those States to clear the landmines. Furthermore, the Convention does not deal adequately with, or provide assistance for, landmine clearance.

Secondly, the Convention did not take into consideration the legal rights of States for self-defence, as stipulated in Article 51 of the United Nations Charter, and the valid need to legitimately use anti-personnel landmines when no other financially feasible alternative exists. This matter is of utmost priority for States that have extended and otherwise unprotected borders that are vulnerable to terrorist infiltration, arms, explosives smuggling and drug-trafficking.

As in previous years Egypt will, during the fifty-fifth session, continue to abstain in the voting on the draft resolution on this subject.

Mr. Lee Kie-cheon (Republic of Korea): My delegation wishes to explain its position on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.44 before the voting. The Republic of Korea shares the humanitarian concerns of the international community about the human suffering and tragic casualties caused by the irresponsible and indiscriminate use of anti-personnel landmines. In this vein, we have supported and made contributions to several United Nations-led mine action programmes.

However, the issue of anti-personnel landmines has not only humanitarian but also security aspects. Anti-personnel landmines still remain a legitimate minimum national defence requirement for some countries throughout the world. The Republic of Korea is at present unable to adhere to the Ottawa Convention. We also wish to stress that the Republic of Korea uses anti-personnel landmines only in a specifically limited area of the demilitarized zone. For that reason, anti-personnel landmines pose few safety concerns for civilians in our country, unlike the situation in other areas.

At the same time, there are parallel mechanisms to control anti-personnel landmines that could ensure the universal participation of all States. For one, my Government declared an indefinite extension of its moratorium on the export of anti-personnel landmines in 1997 and since then has implemented it faithfully. Furthermore, this year we plan to accede to the

Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons and its amended Protocol II. We also support the negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament on the treaty banning the transfer of anti-personnel landmines.

This draft resolution, in operative paragraph 1 in particular, fails to address all these concerns. Therefore, my delegation will abstain.

Mr. Itzchaki (Israel): My delegation wishes to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.44, entitled "Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on Their Destruction".

Israel supports the ultimate humanitarian goal of the Ottawa Convention, aimed at eliminating the consequences of the indiscriminate use of anti-personnel landmines. Towards that end Israel has begun taking concrete steps to lessen the proliferation and harmful effects of anti-personnel landmines in the Middle East and beyond. Israel has joined several international initiatives that share that aim. Only recently Israel ratified the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons (CCW) Protocol on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Mines, Booby Traps and Other Devices, as amended in May 1996, and therefore joined the sponsors of the draft resolution on the CCW contained in document A/C.1/55/L.50.

Israel is actively participating in the mine awareness project launched by the United Nations Children's Fund in Angola. Israeli volunteers are involved in the project, through direct, hands-on teaching of the population about mine awareness and enriching the wider educational system in this area. In addition, Israel has contributed to the financial needs of this important project. Additionally, in July 1994 Israel enacted a moratorium on the export of anti-personnel landmines. Last year we announced our decision to renew the moratorium until the year 2002. We are also considering favourably a permanent arrangement that will extend the moratorium indefinitely.

Israel supported the General Assembly's call for a moratorium and hopes to contribute to an agreement banning all transfers of anti-personnel landmines. Along those lines, Israel ceased all production of such landmines. We hope that all our neighbours will enact a similar moratorium. Israel supports a gradual regional process in which each State in the Middle East will strive to reduce the indiscriminate use of landmines and move towards the eventual goal of a total ban. We believe that the best way to achieve this lies along the path of future regional cooperation. Israel has adopted this gradual approach because it is still required to resort to defensive operations against terrorists to prevent attacks on its civilians. Therefore, we remain unable at present to support the immediate enactment of a total ban on landmines because they remain necessary to ensure the safety of our troops and civilians. I would emphasize that the use and quantity of landmines are restricted and their use remains strictly within the constraints set by the amended Protocol II of the CCW.

For the reasons I mentioned earlier, Israel cannot lend its support to the draft resolution and therefore will abstain.

Mr. Abubaker (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (*spoke in Arabic*): Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.44, entitled "Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on Their Destruction", the draft resolution does not actually require the elimination of these weapons, and so we plan to abstain.

The Chairman: If no other delegation wishes to speak, the Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.44.

A recorded vote has been requested.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Lin Kuo-chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.44, entitled "Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on Their Destruction", was introduced by the representative of Norway at the Committee's 19th meeting, on 20 October 2000. The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.44 are listed in the draft resolution itself and in document A/C.1/55/INF.2. In addition, the following countries have become sponsors of the draft resolution: Mauritius and Turkmenistan. The programme budget implications of the draft resolution are contained in document A/C.1/55/L.52.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Azerbaijan, China, Cuba, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Egypt, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Micronesia (Federated States of), Morocco, Myanmar, Pakistan, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Syrian Arab Republic, United States of America, Uzbekistan, Viet Nam

Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.44 was adopted by 127 votes to none, with 22 abstentions.

The Chairman: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes or positions on the draft resolution just adopted.

May I first appeal to representatives to switch off their cellular phones so that we can keep order in the conference room. The Committee is in the midst of voting and its work should not be hampered in any manner.

Ms. Mendis (Sri Lanka): The Sri Lankan delegation would like to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.44, which has just been adopted. My delegation voted in favour, as on past occasions, in appreciation of the humanitarian objectives of the Convention banning anti-personnel mines. However, the Government of Sri Lanka is not yet in a position to accede to the Convention on account of essential national security considerations.

Mr. Samsar (Turkey): As we have done for the past two years, we would like once again to share with the members of the Committee the considerations that led my delegation to cast a "yes" vote on the draft resolution entitled "Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on Their Destruction", A/C.1/55/L.44.

Turkey is fully conscious of the human suffering and casualties caused by the irresponsible and indiscriminate use of mines. We attach importance to the mine-ban Convention and consider that it is one of the major achievements of the international community towards the elimination of anti-personnel mines. Nonetheless, the security situation around Turkey is distinctly different from that which the proponents of the Ottawa process face. This unique security situation has prevented us from acceding to the Convention so far. However, our commitment to the goals of the Convention was made known by our participation as an observer at the First and Second Meetings of the States Parties to the Convention.

Turkey, in order to fulfil its commitments with regard to the objectives of the Convention, put into effect a national moratorium banning the sale and transfer of anti-personnel mines in January 1996. It was extended in 1998 until the year 2002. Furthermore, we have initiated a number of contacts with some neighbouring countries for the establishment of special regimes in order to keep our common borders free from anti-personnel mines. In this regard, an agreement was

concluded in March 1999 between Bulgaria and Turkey. Demining activities are due to start very soon. We have proposed similar projects to Greece, Azerbaijan and Georgia, and hope to finalize these projects successfully as well.

Mr. Thu (Myanmar): I should like to explain my delegation's decision on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.44, relating to the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on Their Destruction. Myanmar is not a State party to the Ottawa Convention, nor did it participate in the Ottawa process, but we respect the decisions of the countries that have signed and ratified the Ottawa Convention.

In principle, Myanmar is in favour of banning the exportation, transfer and indiscriminate use of anti-personnel mines, but at the same time we believe that every State has the right to self-defence. It is essential that every State should be able to exercise the right of self-defence when its national security and supreme interests are at stake. We recognize that the indiscriminate use of anti-personnel landmines is causing death and injury to innocent children, women and men. The easy availability of landmines is the main reason behind those tragedies. One important way in which we could prevent them is by addressing the issues of illicit trafficking and indiscriminate use of landmines by non-State actors. In our opinion, a sweeping, total ban on anti-personnel landmines is not yet a practical and effective measure under prevailing circumstances. We believe that the proper place to discuss the problem is at the Conference on Disarmament. For these reasons my delegation abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.44.

Mr. Teo (Singapore): Singapore's position on anti-personnel landmines has been clear and open. My country supports and will continue to support all initiatives against the indiscriminate use of anti-personnel landmines, especially when they are directed at innocent and defenceless civilians. In this regard, in May 1996 Singapore declared a two-year moratorium on the export of anti-personnel landmines without self-neutralizing mechanisms, and in February 1998 Singapore extended that moratorium to include all manner of anti-personnel landmines, not just those without self-neutralizing mechanisms, and extended the moratorium for an indefinite period. At the same time, along with several other countries, Singapore firmly believes that for any State, legitimate security concerns and the right to self-defence cannot be disregarded. A blanket ban on all types of anti-personnel landmines might therefore be counterproductive since some countries need to use anti-personnel landmines for their defence and security.

Singapore supports international efforts to resolve humanitarian concerns over anti-personnel landmines. We will continue to work with members of the international community towards finding a durable and truly global solution.

Mr. Benítez Verson (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): As in past years we abstained in the voting on the draft resolution entitled "Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on Their Destruction", A/C.1/55/L.44. We fully share the humanitarian concerns over the damage done by the indiscriminate and irresponsible use of mines. For that reason we have always supported the prohibition of their use against innocent civilian populations and in internal conflicts. All international transfers of these arms should also be banned. However, they continue to be a necessary, legitimate means of defence for many countries, particularly developing countries, which do not have sufficient resources for alternative means of defending themselves. As in past years, the draft resolution prepared this year does not portray an adequate balance between humanitarian issues and legitimate concerns for national security relating to mines.

For 40 years Cuba has suffered from the constant policy of aggression and hostility of another country, which is the largest military and economic power in the world. We cannot abandon the use of mines for defending our sovereignty and territorial integrity. At the same time, we continue to support all efforts to eliminate the horrible consequences for the civilian populations of many countries resulting from the indiscriminate and irresponsible use of landmines.

Mr. Mukul (India): My delegation would like to set forth its position on the issue of anti-personnel landmines and the reasons which led it to abstain in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.44, entitled "Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on Their Destruction".

India remains committed to the objective of a non-discriminatory, universal and global ban on anti-personnel landmines through a phased process that addresses the legitimate defence requirements of States while ameliorating the critical humanitarian crises that have resulted from the indiscriminate transfer and use of landmines. We believe that a phased approach commends itself as a confidence-building process enabling States, especially those with long borders, to safeguard their legitimate security needs. The process of the complete elimination of anti-personnel mines will be facilitated by addressing the legitimate defensive role of anti-personnel landmines for operational requirements under the defence doctrines of the countries concerned, through the availability of appropriate, militarily effective, non-lethal alternative technologies that can perform cost-effectively the legitimate defensive role of anti-personnel landmines.

We would support negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament for a ban on transfers of anti-personnel landmines on the basis of a mandate that reflects the interests of all delegations. India has been an active participant in the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons process and has ratified all its Protocols, including amended Protocol II, on landmines.

Mr. Akram (Pakistan): Pakistan's position on anti-personnel landmines was elaborated in our general statement. Pakistan was one of the earliest adherents to the United Nations Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or To Have Indiscriminate Effects (CCW). That Convention includes the Protocol on restrictions governing the use of anti-personnel landmines.

Even before the Convention came into existence, Pakistan had a record of strict observance of humanitarian laws during armed conflicts. These rules were later embodied in the Convention and its Protocols. Our adherence to the Convention and its Protocols was therefore without hesitation or delay.

Unfortunately, Pakistan has a long border and lives under the constant threat of the use of force, particularly by a sizeable land force deployed against us. We are therefore constrained to have resort to anti-personnel landmines in our posture of self-defence. We believe that at this moment the international community could usefully focus on universal adherence to the new Protocol II of the CCW, because we believe that Protocol will lead to the resolution of almost all the humanitarian problems that have resulted from the widespread and indiscriminate use of anti-personnel landmines.

Secondly, the international community, especially those nations in a financial position to do so, must support an invigorated programme to eliminate landmines which were laid in the past and which are responsible for thousands of fatalities each year. We regret the inadequacy of the financial and other resources devoted to mine clearance. Pakistan will continue to make in-kind contributions to regional and global demining efforts.

Thirdly, we believe that the Conference on Disarmament could also take some steps to promote progress towards the ultimate goal of prohibiting anti-personnel landmines without jeopardizing the security of States, steps such as a ban on exports of anti-personnel landmines. Pakistan has in place an effective moratorium on the export of anti-personnel landmines.

Given our defence posture and the approach I have outlined, my delegation was constrained to abstain in the voting on the draft resolution, while appreciating the noble motives and objectives that inspired the sponsors of the draft resolution.

Mr. Baiedi-Nejad (Islamic Republic of Iran): The Islamic Republic of Iran shares the sentiments of States adhering to the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on Their Destruction with regard to removing the immediate threat posed by landmines, particularly against innocent civilians. The great number of landmines used irresponsibly by military and armed factions during civil wars, which took place as a consequence of the disruption of stability in certain particular regions of the world, claimed a great number of innocent lives, particularly among women and children. This situation is not acceptable and we welcome every effort to stop this trend.

The landmines Convention, although far from a conclusive and comprehensive response to this tragedy, may be considered to be a move to have some effect, particularly in certain regions of the world. The Convention, however, for understandable security reasons, has not been received with enthusiasm in other regions of the world. Landmines traditionally continue to be the sole effective means of ensuring the minimum

requirements of security of borders in many countries with long land borders. Countries such as mine, with long borders and no possibility of monitoring the extensive sensitive areas with established and permanent guard posts or effective warning systems, are still dependent on landmines. Because of these security considerations my country could not join in support of this draft resolution and abstained in the voting on it.

But the landmines process is an evolving one, and complementary efforts need to be pursued. My country appreciates that alongside the efforts to ban landmines some efforts, however limited, should be made to explore new alternatives to landmines which, while having the same effect, would not pose any threat to civilians. In the meantime, the observance and strengthening of standards to limit the use of landmines are necessary. My country strongly observes the established rules and regulations on limiting landmines to certain particular places on borders and takes all precautionary steps to keep civilians completely away from the minefields.

International efforts are also necessary to speed up mine clearance activities within the United Nations system. My country, faced with millions of landmines laid in its territory during past years, has a particular interest in this area. We are encouraged by the recent initiatives to increase awareness and international cooperation in the field of mine clearance. Much of course remains to be done, and we hope for more tangible and practical endeavours to assist all States in mine clearance activities.

The Chairman: We now come to cluster 5. If no delegations wish to make general statements or comments on draft resolutions contained in cluster 5, regional disarmament and security, the Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.35. I call first on those representatives wishing to explain their position or vote before a decision is taken.

Mr. Mukul (India): My delegation has asked for the floor to explain its position before the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.35, entitled "Conventional arms control at the regional and subregional levels".

In 1993 the United Nations Disarmament Commission adopted consensus guidelines on regional approaches to disarmament within the context of global security. Therefore, we are not convinced that this draft resolution, in particular operative paragraph 2, which calls on the Conference on Disarmament, a forum for negotiation of disarmament instruments of global application, to consider the formulation of principles that can serve as a framework for regional agreements on conventional arms control, has any productive value. A reference is made in the sixth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution to conventional arms control in South Asia. India has security concerns that cannot be confined to what is referred to as "South Asia". The narrow definition of the draft resolution does not fully reflect the security concerns in South Asia and adopts an approach that is far too restrictive. These reasons have also been spelt out in the past and, accordingly, my delegation will be casting a negative vote on the draft resolution as a whole.

The Chairman: The Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.35.

A recorded vote has been requested.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Lin Kuo-chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.35, entitled "Conventional arms control at the regional and subregional levels", was introduced by the representative of Pakistan at the Committee's 17th meeting, on 18 October 2000. The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.35 are listed in the draft resolution itself and in document A/C.1/55/INF.2. In addition, Ukraine has also become a sponsor of the draft resolution.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran

(Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

India

Abstaining:

Bhutan

Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.35 was adopted by 145 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.

[*Subsequently, the delegation of Benin informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.*]

The Chairman: If no representatives wish to explain their votes or positions on the draft resolution just adopted, we shall now proceed to cluster 6.

If no delegations wish to make general comments or statements on draft resolutions contained in cluster 6, confidence-building measures, including transparency in armaments, the Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.12.

If no delegations wish to explain their position or vote before action is taken on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.12, the Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.12. I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Lin Kuo-chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.12, entitled "Regional confidence-building measures: activities of the United Nations Standing Advisory Committee on Security Questions in Central Africa", was introduced by the representative of Burundi at the Committee's 21st meeting, on 23 October 2000. The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.12 are listed in the draft resolution itself. The programme budget implications of the draft resolution are contained in document A/C/1/55/L.51.

The Chairman: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.12 have expressed the wish that the draft resolution be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I will take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.12 was adopted.

The Chairman: If no representatives wish to explain their votes or positions on the draft resolution just adopted, we now come to cluster 7. I first call on delegations wishing to make general statements or comments on draft resolutions contained in cluster 7, disarmament machinery.

Mr. Thapa (Nepal): My delegation wishes to make a few remarks concerning draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.33, entitled "United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Asia and the Pacific".

When the draft resolution was introduced to the Committee by my delegation, I recall making some comments regarding some editorial corrections to be incorporated in operative paragraph 4, line 2 on page 2 of the draft resolution. My delegation points out that the correction in line 2 should read: "as well as to international governmental and non-governmental organizations" and then the paragraph continues as set out. I hope these corrections will be reflected in time.

The text before us is the result of negotiations among the sponsors and other interested delegations, which were conducted before the draft resolution was submitted. Certainly the draft resolution contains a few new elements when compared with last year's resolution, in view of the reality that member countries wished to be reflected in this year's draft resolution. In

particular I wish to mention that additional operative paragraph 6, which reads

> "*Appreciates* the generous offer of His Majesty's Government of Nepal to bear the operational cost of the Centre for it to function from Kathmandu",

is the result of the strong commitment by the people and the Government of Nepal to have the Centre operationally functioning in Kathmandu as soon as possible.

In this respect my delegation hopes that the Committee will adopt this non-controversial, constructive and forward-looking draft resolution by consensus, as has occurred in similar cases every year.

Mr. Salazar (Peru) (*spoke in Spanish*): A year after the Centre recommenced its activities, and considering the vast range of activities of the United Nations Regional Centre for Peace, Disarmament and Development in Latin America and the Caribbean in Lima, which are supported by a broad conceptual framework for peace, draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.17, which was introduced by Belize, as Chairman of the Latin American and Caribbean Group, expresses its satisfaction at the positive effect of the collective decision that allowed those activities to be carried out. I hope that the draft resolution will have the full support of the Committee.

With the relaunching of the Centre, the Department for Disarmament Affairs has extended one of the arms of the Organization to our region. The Regional Centre for Peace, Disarmament and Development has a well-known general mandate, but I should like to emphasize its promotion of the transfer of information on military matters, other confidence-building measures, assistance to member States in multilateral negotiations on disarmament and efforts to foster regional promotion of disarmament, including nuclear disarmament. We believe that the mandate has been propitious and highly beneficial to the region, in particular with a view to preparations for the important negotiations on disarmament and arms control which are to take place soon.

This year the draft resolution refers to the activities carried out by the Centre. In particular it invites the States of the region to propose items for inclusion in its agenda and to become increasingly active in the Centre. Thus, the work of the Centre will provide a response to the requests and objectives of the countries of Latin America and the Caribbean and to their own particular characteristics within the broad range of security and development activities.

Finally, we welcome the fact that a number of countries have expressed interest even though they are outside the region. We appreciate their offers of support and material so that the Centre can continue its activities.

The Chairman: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.3/Rev.1.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Lin Kuo-chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.3/Rev.1, entitled "Twentieth anniversary of the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research", was introduced by the representative of France at the Committee's 21st meeting, on 23 October 2000. The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.3/Rev.1 are listed in the draft resolution itself. In addition, the following countries have become sponsors of the draft resolution: Bosnia and Herzegovina , Malta and Slovenia.

The Chairman: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.3/Rev.1 have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.3/Rev.1 was adopted.

The Chairman: If no representatives wish to explain their position on the draft resolution just adopted, the Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.5.

If no representatives wish to explain their position or vote before action is taken, the Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.5. I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Lin Kuo-chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.5, entitled "Report of the Conference on Disarmament", was introduced by the representative of Bulgaria at the Committee's 12th meeting, on 12 October 2000.

The Chairman: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.5 have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no

objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.5 was adopted.

The Chairman: If no representatives wish to explain their position on the draft resolution just adopted, the Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.9.

If no delegations wish to explain their position or vote before action is taken, the Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.9. I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Lin Kuo-chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.9, entitled "United Nations Disarmament Information Programme", was introduced by the representative of Mexico at the Committee's 17th meeting, on 18 October 2000. The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.9 are listed in the draft resolution itself and in document A/C.1/55/INF.2. In addition, the following countries have become sponsors of the draft resolution: Malaysia and New Zealand.

The Chairman: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.9 have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.9 was adopted.

The Chairman: If no delegations wish to explain their position on the draft resolution just adopted, the Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.13*. I call first on those delegations wishing to explain their position or vote before a decision is taken.

Mr. Benítez Verson (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): As has been done traditionally, Cuba will join the consensus on the subject addressed in draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.13, entitled "United Nations disarmament fellowship, training and advisory services". Within the United Nations system there are probably very few fellowship programmes that set such a clear example of the specific results that can be achieved when resources are used to train public officials, in particular officials from developing countries. However, I have taken the floor not only to recognize the results of the fellowship programme, but also to express the Cuban Government's concern about a regrettable event that occurred this year in the fellowship programme, which is still located in New York.

According to the original plan of the programme for this year, at the end of their stay in New York the fellows were supposed to carry out a study visit to New Mexico, United States, followed by a visit to Washington. However, the Government of the United States took the decision not to allow the Cuban fellow who was participating in the programme this year to visit New Mexico and Washington. A similar decision was taken with regard to the fellows from two other countries. This meant that the group could not carry out these study visits to New Mexico and Washington as planned, and the original fellowship programme therefore had to be reduced to barely one week.

Cuba feels that it is unacceptable to continue these absurd discriminatory practices that defy reasonable explanation and directly affect the training of future disarmament experts from many countries represented here in this room. Such an attitude runs counter to the excellent attention offered by Switzerland, the Netherlands, Austria, Germany and Japan to all the fellows when they visited those countries.

In the case of Cuba, such unilateral practices by the United States are not limited to the fellowship programme. I will cite only one recent example. Because of an unexplained delay in granting visas, which were requested well in advance on the basis of rules established by the Government of the United States itself, two members of the Cuban delegation to the First Committee for this session, who had to come from our capital, were able to join in the work only when it was already well under way. Cuba reiterates its firm rejection of this type of practice and calls upon the Government of the United States to meet its obligations as a host country.

I would like to conclude by thanking the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.13 for having presented a corrected version of the text which takes into account our concerns with regard to operative paragraph 4, and we hope that in future the United Nations disarmament fellowship, training and advisory services can continue to carry out their work without regrettable incidents that in no way whatsoever contribute to the attainment of its objectives.

Mr. Mekdad (Syrian Arab Republic) (*spoke in Arabic*): Once again we would like to voice our full

support for the United Nations disarmament fellowship, training and advisory services. This important programme has enabled many students from different countries of the world to benefit from the experience and expertise available in many developed countries and to learn about their positions on these important issues. It is the duty of all countries to be totally transparent and objective in providing these services, irrespective of the countries the fellows come from. However, unfortunately, we note that the host country, the United States of America, did not authorize the fellows from Syria and two other countries to visit according to the programme that had been prepared within the United Nations Secretariat, despite the prior agreement of the United States to the programme prepared by the United Nations. My delegation considers there is no justification for that kind of discriminatory position. It is contrary to the objectives of the fellowship programme, and such actions are contrary to the commitments and responsibilities of the host country vis-à-vis the United Nations. We would voice the hope that the host country will cooperate with the Secretary-General of the United Nations and take the necessary steps to ensure there is no recurrence of such incidents or practices in future.

In conclusion, I would like to voice my appreciation to the countries that prepared draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.13. We fully and completely support the draft resolution.

The Chairman: The Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.13*.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Lin Kuo-chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.13*, entitled "United Nations disarmament fellowship, training and advisory services", was introduced by the representative of Nigeria at the Committee's 20th meeting, on 20 October 2000. The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.13* are listed in the draft resolution itself and in document A/C.1/55/INF.2. In addition the following countries have become sponsors of the draft resolution: India, Myanmar and Indonesia.

The Chairman: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.13* have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.13 was adopted.*

The Chairman: If no representatives wish to explain their position on the draft resolution just adopted, the Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.14/Rev.2. I call first on those representatives wishing to explain their position or vote before a decision is taken.

Mr. Ngoh Ngoh (Cameroon) (*spoke in French*): My delegation wishes to speak in explanation of its position on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.14/Rev.2, entitled "United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Africa". The Centre has done a significant amount of work despite inadequate resources, in particular its work on the implementation of the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) Moratorium on small arms and light weapons. We endorse draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.14/Rev.2, particularly the provisions stating that the Centre must be given the necessary resources to strengthen its activities and implement its programmes. We will happily join the consensus on the draft resolution, as we have done with similar draft resolutions in past years.

Mr. Moungara-Moussotsi (Gabon) (*spoke in French*): Like the representative of Cameroon, I should like to speak on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.14/Rev.2, entitled "United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Africa". As my delegation said during the general debate, the Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Africa is a very useful body for Africa in that it encourages the adoption of confidence-building measures and arms limitation at the regional level. In this way it promotes sustainable harmonious development. We would like to express our support for operative paragraphs 2 and 3 of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.14/Rev.2. Those paragraphs speak about the need for financial support for the Centre to help it to work effectively and carry out its work programmes, which are so helpful to Africa. My delegation, therefore, will join the consensus on the draft resolution.

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.14/Rev.2. I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Lin Kuo-chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.14/Rev.2, entitled "United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and

Disarmament in Africa", was introduced by the representative of Lesotho at the Committee's 19th meeting, on 20 October 2000, on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Group of African States.

The Chairman: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.14/Rev.2 have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.14/Rev.2 was adopted.

The Chairman: If no representatives wish to explain their position on the draft resolution just adopted, the Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.17.

If no representatives wish to explain their position or vote before action is taken, the Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.17. I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Lin Kuo-chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.17, entitled "United Nations Regional Centre for Peace, Disarmament and Development in Latin America and the Caribbean", was introduced by the representative of Belize at the Committee's 20th meeting, on 20 October 2000, on behalf of the Latin American and Caribbean States.

The Chairman: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.17 have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.17 was adopted.

The Chairman: If no delegations wish to explain their position on the draft resolution just adopted, the Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.23.

If no representatives wish to explain their position or vote before action is taken, the Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.23. I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Lin Kuo-chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.23, entitled "Convening of the fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament", was introduced by the representative of South Africa at the Committee's 18th meeting, on 19 October 2000, on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries.

The Chairman: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.23 have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.23 was adopted.

The Chairman: If no representatives wish to explain their position on the draft resolution just adopted, the Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.24.

If no representatives wish to explain their position or vote before action is taken, the Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.24.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Lin Kuo-chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.24, entitled "United Nations regional centres for peace and disarmament", was introduced by the representative of South Africa at the Committee's 18th meeting, on 19 October 2000, on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries.

The Chairman: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.24 have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.24 was adopted.

The Chairman: If no delegations wish to explain their position on the draft resolution just adopted, the Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.26.

If no representatives wish to explain their position or vote before action is taken, the Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.26.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Lin Kuo-chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.26, entitled "Report of the Disarmament Commission", was introduced by the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran at the Committee's 17th meeting, on 18 October 2000. The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.26 are listed in the draft resolution itself.

The Chairman: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.26 have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.26 was adopted.

The Chairman: If no representatives wish to explain their position on the draft resolution just adopted, the Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.33.

If no representatives wish to explain their position or vote before action is taken, we shall now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.33. I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Lin Kuo-chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.33, entitled "United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Asia and the Pacific", was introduced by the representative of Nepal at the Committee's 18th meeting, on 19 October 2000. The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.33 are listed in the draft resolution itself and in document A/C.1/55/INF.2. In addition, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea has become a sponsor of the draft resolution.

Moreover, I should like to draw the attention of delegations to some editorial changes in operative paragraph 4. In line 2 the word "government" should be replaced by the word "governmental" and the word "non-government" should be replaced by the word "non-governmental".

The Chairman: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.33 have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.33, as orally revised, was adopted.

The Chairman: I now call upon those delegations wishing to explain their position on the draft resolution just adopted.

Mr. Al-Hassan (Oman) (*spoke in Arabic*): My delegation joined the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.33, entitled "United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Asia and the Pacific". We are in that region, and we approve of the recent steps taken to continue the functioning of the Centre. We wish to express our appreciation to Nepal for its hosting of the United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Asia and the Pacific. We also commend what has been done by the King of Nepal to bear the expenses of the Centre. At the last meeting of the Committee my delegation said that it hoped the Centre could begin functioning as soon as possible because it focuses not just on one part of the region but covers the entire region and deals with all issues. My delegation therefore wishes to lend its full support to the draft resolution that has just been adopted. We would like action to be taken swiftly so that the Centre can begin functioning. As I have said, we greatly appreciate the part played by the King of Nepal in helping to facilitate this.

The Chairman: The Committee has completed its consideration of and action on draft resolutions for this morning.

The meeting rose at 12.25 p.m.

United Nations A/C.1/55/PV.24

General Assembly
Fifty-fifth session

Official Records

First Committee
24th meeting
Friday, 27 October 2000, 10 a.m.
New York

Chairman: U Mya Than ..... (Myanmar)

The meeting was called to order at 10.25 a.m.

Agenda items 65 to 81 (*continued*)

Action on all draft resolutions submitted under all items

The Chairman: Today the Committee will continue to take action on draft resolutions that appear in informal working paper No.3/Rev.1, following the sequence indicated: in cluster 1, nuclear weapons, draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.48 will not be ready until Monday, so the Committee will not be taking action on that draft resolution today; in cluster 7, disarmament machinery, A/C.1/55/L.10; in cluster 8, other disarmament measures, A/C.1/55/L.6, A/C.1/55/L.21, A/C.1/55/L.22 and A/C.1/55/L.31; in cluster 9, related matters of disarmament and international security, A/C.1/55/L.15; and in cluster 10, international security, A/C.1/55/L.27.

I call first on those delegations wishing to introduce revised draft resolutions.

Mr. Issa (Egypt): The delegation of Egypt is pleased to present draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.29/Rev.1, entitled "The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East".

We have conducted extensive consultations during recent weeks with all interested delegations and groups on this draft resolution, and the present draft before the Committee is a sincere and honest attempt to reflect the remarks and concerns that were conveyed to us in the course of those consultations. A new operative paragraph has been added, now operative paragraph 1, which welcomes the conclusions on the Middle East of the 2000 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). What is now operative paragraph 3 calls upon the remaining State in the Middle East that is not yet a party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons to accede to the Treaty without further delay, not to develop, produce, test or otherwise acquire nuclear weapons, to renounce possession of nuclear weapons and to place all its unsafeguarded nuclear facilities under full-scope International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards.

As my delegation stressed when it first presented this draft resolution last week, the draft resolution extends the invitation to Israel to join the 182 States that have renounced the nuclear-weapons option, an invitation whose acceptance has become a moral and political obligation that members of the international community are obligated to pursue if the NPT is to remain a credible instrument and to continue to have non-proliferation value.

I further stress that the draft resolution before the Committee in document A/C.1/55/L.29/Rev.1 is not confrontational in nature but, rather, prompts the remaining State in the region of the Middle East that is not a party to the NPT to accept the same legally binding non-proliferation commitments as all other States in the region — and, indeed, as the majority of the members of the international community — have done, and to refrain from any action that could

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room C-178. Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum.

00-71330 (E)

undermine regional and international peace and security.

The draft resolution continues to take account of developments during the course of the year 2000, particularly those of the past six months, developments which have particular significance as they relate to the region of the Middle East. On behalf of the States sponsors of the draft resolution, we urge Member States of the United Nations to send the clear message that there is no selectivity when it comes to non-proliferation and that the consensus agreed to five months ago is respected. That message would best be conveyed by a positive vote for this draft resolution.

Mr. Rybakov (Belarus) (*spoke in Russian*): Allow me to present the revised draft resolution entitled "Regional disarmament and non-proliferation", which has been issued as document A/C.1/55/L.46/Rev.1. This document is the result of intensive consultations between interested countries on the question of regional initiatives on nuclear non-proliferation. The draft resolution specifically addresses the aspect of the establishment of new nuclear-weapon-free zones in various regions of the planet.

In his statement at the Millennium Summit the President of the Republic of Belarus, followed by the Minister for Foreign Affairs in the general debate and the First Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs in the discussion in the First Committee, clearly and fully reflected the well-known approach of the Republic of Belarus to the establishment of new nuclear-weapon-free zones. At its current session the General Assembly has on several occasions demonstrated the ability to reach compromises on complex issues of international life, inter alia, on problems of international security and disarmament. This draft resolution is no exception. It once again reaffirms general support for mankind's aspiration to a world free from nuclear weapons.

We would also note that the draft resolution reflects the fundamental principle of agreement between States on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in their region. The agreement of countries of the region is an indispensable prerequisite for further progress in any similar initiative and for the discussion of ways for its practical realization. In addition, the text welcomes and supports the steps taken to conclude further nuclear-weapon-free zone treaties and reaffirms the conviction of the international community that the establishment of internationally recognized nuclear-weapon-free zones on the basis of arrangements freely arrived at among the States of the region concerned enhances global and regional peace and security, strengthens the nuclear non-proliferation regime and contributes towards realizing the objectives of nuclear disarmament.

Operative paragraph 2 expresses the intention of the international community to continue to promote the establishment of new nuclear-weapon-free zones in accordance with the relevant guidelines of the United Nations Disarmament Commission on this issue, and in that spirit welcomes the efforts and proposals that have been made by States in various regions of the world.

We are convinced that this draft is constructive and non-confrontational, retains the integrity and unity of the general approach, reaffirms support for the efforts of all countries for the establishment of new nuclear-weapon-free zones and is forward-looking. We are grateful to all delegations with which consultations were held for their cooperative approach to achieving a positive result, and to the search for and achievement of mutual understanding and a compromise solution. We express the hope that this draft resolution will receive unanimous support and will be adopted without a vote.

The Chairman: If no other delegation wishes to speak at this stage, I shall now call on delegations wishing to make general statements or comments on draft resolutions contained in cluster 7, disarmament machinery.

There being none, the Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.10. If no representatives wish to explain their position or vote before a decision is taken, the Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.10. I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Lin Kuo-chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.10, entitled "United Nations study on disarmament and non-proliferation education", was introduced by the representative of Mexico at the Committee's 17th meeting, on 18 October 2000. The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.10 are listed in the draft resolution itself and in document A/C.1/55/INF.2. In addition, the following countries have become sponsors of the draft resolution: Algeria, India and New Zealand.

In connection with draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.10, on disarmament and non-proliferation education I should like to make the following statement on financial implications on behalf of the Secretary-General.

By operative paragraphs 1 and 2 of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.10 the General Assembly would — request the Secretary-General to prepare, with the assistance of a group of qualified governmental experts, a study on disarmament and non-proliferation education that would have a number of specific substantive tasks; and request the Secretary-General to report to the General Assembly at its fifty-seventh session.

It is envisaged that the group of experts would hold its sessions in New York according to the following schedule: one session in March 2001, one session in July or August 2001, one in March 2002 and one session in July/August 2002. The conference-servicing requirements at full cost are estimated to be $136,800 in 2001. With regard to the sessions to be held in 2001, the extent to which the organizational capacity would need to be supplemented by temporary assistance resources can be determined only in the light of the calendar of conferences and meetings for the biennium 2000-2001.

However, provision is made under section 2, General Assembly Affairs and Conference Services, of the programme budget for the biennium 2000-2001 not only for meetings programmed at the time of the budget preparation but also for meetings authorized subsequently, provided that the number and distribution of meetings is consistent with the pattern of meetings of past years. Consequently, should the General Assembly adopt the draft resolution in question, no additional appropriation would be required for conference servicing in the biennium 2000-2001.

The conference-servicing requirements for the sessions to be held in 2002 would be considered in the context of the preparation of the Secretary-General's proposed programme budget for the biennium 2002-2003. Provisions have been made under section 4, disarmament, of the programme budget for the 2000-2001 biennium which would allow the Department for Disarmament Affairs to provide the necessary substantive service to the two sessions of the proposed group of governmental experts to be held in New York in 2001. Provisions for the preparation of a report for consideration by the General Assembly at its fifty-seventh session would be made in the context of the Secretary-General's proposed programme budget for the biennium 2002-2003. Therefore, should the General Assembly adopt draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.10, no additional requirements would arise under the programme budget for the biennium 2000-2001.

The Chairman: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.10 have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.10 was adopted.

The Chairman: If no representatives wish to explain their position on the draft resolution just adopted, we will now move to the next cluster.

I call on delegations wishing to make general statements or comments on draft resolutions contained in cluster 8, other disarmament measures.

There being none, the Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.6. If no representatives wish to explain their position or vote before a decision is taken, the Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.6.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Lin Kuo-chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.6, entitled "Developments in the field of information and telecommunications in the context of international security", was introduced by the representative of the Russian Federation at the Committee's 18th meeting, on 19 October 2000. The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.6 are listed in the draft resolution itself.

The Chairman: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.6 have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.6 was adopted.

The Chairman: If no representatives wish to explain their position on the draft resolution just adopted, the Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.21. I call first on those representatives wishing to explain their position or vote before a decision is taken.

Mr. Al-Kilani (Iraq) (*spoke in Arabic*): I should like to explain our position on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.21. Resolutions adopted by the United Nations reaffirm the need for all States to fulfil commitments made on the basis of environmental norms embodied in various agreements. From a review of the commitments made during the past 10 years, it would appear that two States, permanent members of the Security Council — namely, the United Kingdom and the United States — have deliberately violated the agreements undertaken in the context of United Nations resolutions concerning environmental preservation. They breached the commitments made on arms control and non-proliferation by using more than 3,000 tons of munitions containing enriched uranium in aggression against Iraq in 1991. Such munitions were also used in 1999 against Yugoslavia.

Munitions containing enriched uranium represent a new type of radioactive weapon, which, when exploded, can threaten the environment by releasing irradiated dust. The results can include diseases such as cancer and the threat of an environmental disaster. This type of radiation can last for 4.5 million years, which gives some idea of the danger posed to the environment of Iraq and of neighbouring countries, as well as the dangers to the health of British and American soldiers who participated in the aggression against Iraq.

It is incumbent upon the international community, represented by the United Nations, to ensure that an international agreement is adopted in order to ban the use of enriched uranium and to take deterrent measures against those States that violate their commitments. We wish to reaffirm here the responsibility of the United States and the United Kingdom for the dangers created and the damage done to the environment in Iraq. That is why we support the draft resolution. We ask all States to respect all its paragraphs and invite members of the First Committee and other United Nations organs to abide by the draft resolution and to consider the consequences of failure to respect the commitments expressed in the draft resolution.

The Chairman: The Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.21.

A recorded vote has been requested.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Lin Kuo-chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.21, entitled "Observance of environmental norms in the drafting and implementation of agreements on disarmament and arms control", was introduced by the representative of South Africa at the Committee's 18th meeting, on 19 October 2000, on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania,

Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

France, Israel, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.21 was adopted by 149 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.

The Chairman: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes or positions on the draft resolution just adopted.

Mr. Grey (United States of America): The United States remains uncertain about the purpose and objectives of this draft resolution and is not convinced of the relevance of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.21 to the work of the First Committee. Simply put, the United States sees no direct connection between general environmental standards and multilateral arms control agreements. Agreements of this kind are uniquely intricate and difficult enough to negotiate without having to consider how to focus on, or draw up, vague environmental norms.

Of course, no one could oppose the idea of preserving the environment. States parties to bilateral, regional or multilateral arms control and disarmament agreements should take relevant environmental concerns into account in carrying out such agreements. The United States Government operates under stringent domestic environmental impact regulations for many activities, including the implementation of arms control and disarmament agreements.

While draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.21 avoids the overly objectionable language used in previous years, we continue to question its relevance, purpose and utility. The United States therefore abstained.

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.22. If no representatives wish to explain their position or vote before action is taken, we shall now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.22. I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Lin Kuo-chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.22, entitled "Relationship between disarmament and development", was introduced by the representative of South Africa at the Committee's 18th meeting, on 19 October 2000, on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries.

The Chairman: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.22 have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.22 was adopted.

The Chairman: I now call upon those representatives who wish to explain their position on the draft resolution just adopted.

Mr. Grey (United States of America): I request that the record of today's proceedings reflect that the United States will not participate in the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.22, which asserts a relationship between disarmament and development. We continue to believe that disarmament and development are two distinct issues that do not lend themselves to being linked. It was for this reason that we did not participate in the 1987 Conference on this matter. Accordingly, the United States does not and will not consider itself bound by the declarations in the Final Document of the International Conference.

Mr. Fieschi (France) (*spoke in French*): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the European Union and the associated Central and Eastern European countries — Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia — and the associated countries Cyprus and Malta. The member States of the European Union joined in the consensus which emerged on the draft resolution on the relationship between disarmament and development and would like to explain the significance of their position.

While we recognize the considerable benefits that can be derived from disarmament, it should be noted that there is no simple, automatic link between the commitments of the European Union in favour of cooperation for economic and social development on the one hand, and savings which could be made in other areas, including disarmament, on the other. Nevertheless, I should like to underscore the significance of the European Union's commitment to cooperation for development and recall that the

European Union is by far the largest contributor of official development assistance.

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.31. If no representatives wish to explain their position or vote before action is taken, we shall now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.31.

A recorded vote has been requested.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Lin Kuo-chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.31, entitled "Role of science and technology in the context of international security and disarmament", was introduced by the representative of India at the Committee's 17th meeting, on 18 October 2000. The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.31 are listed in the draft resolution itself and in document A/C.1/55/INF.2.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Saint Lucia, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Brazil, Georgia, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Paraguay, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Samoa, South Africa, Tonga, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, Uruguay

Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.31 was adopted by 91 votes to 44, with 17 abstentions.

The Chairman: I now call upon those representatives who wish to explain their position on the draft resolution just adopted.

As there are none, I call on the representative of India on a point of order.

Mr. Mukul (India): Before the vote we submitted a list of additional sponsors of the draft resolution. For the record, I think I should mention that the delegations of Burkina Faso, Mauritius and Namibia have joined the list of sponsors.

The Chairman: The remarks of the representative of India have been duly noted.

We shall now move to cluster 9. If no delegations wish to make general statements or comments on draft resolutions contained in cluster 9, related matters of disarmament and international security, the Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.15.

If no representatives wish to explain their position or vote before action is taken, we shall now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.15. I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Lin Kuo-chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.15, entitled "Consolidation of peace through practical disarmament measures", was introduced by the representative of Germany at the Committee's 16th meeting, on 17 October 2000. The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.15 are listed in the draft resolution itself and in document A/C.1/55/INF.2.

The Chairman: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.15 have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.15 was adopted.

The Chairman: If no delegations wish to explain their position on the draft resolution just adopted, we shall now move to cluster 10.

If no delegations wish to make general statements or comments on draft resolutions contained in cluster 10, international security, the Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.27.

If no representatives wish to explain their position or vote before action is taken, the Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.27. I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Lin Kuo-chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.27, entitled "Strengthening of security and cooperation in the Mediterranean region", was introduced by the representative of Algeria at the Committee's 16th meeting, on 17 October 2000. The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.27 are listed in the draft resolution itself and in document A/C.1/55/INF.2.

The Chairman: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.27 have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.27 was adopted.

The Chairman: There being no delegations wishing to explain their position on the draft resolution just adopted, we have concluded consideration of the draft resolutions scheduled for this morning.

I should like to take this opportunity to say that I am pleased to recognize the presence of Ambassador Wolfgang Hoffmann, Executive Secretary of the Preparatory Commission for the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty Organization, in our midst. We are very happy to see him and extend him a warm welcome. He used to address the First Committee, but this year he is to address the plenary Assembly. We appreciate his contribution to the cause of disarmament.

The Chairman: Under rule 120 of the rules of procedure, no draft resolution or proposal or amendment shall be discussed or put to the vote until copies of it have been circulated to all delegations no later than the day preceding the meeting. In other words, there is a 24-hour rule. However, I think we can dispense with the 24-hour rule in this case. I put the following proposal to the Committee: that the scheduled meeting of the Committee for this afternoon be cancelled, as the draft resolutions are not ready for consideration. Is there any objection to that proposal? I hear none.

It was so decided.

The Chairman: It is just a matter of good planning. It will not be worthwhile to convene an afternoon meeting to consider only one draft resolution. We will squeeze that into the programme for the meeting on Monday.

The meeting rose at 11.15 a.m.

United Nations A/C.1/55/PV.25

General Assembly
Fifty-fifth session

Official Records

First Committee
25th meeting
Monday, 30 October 2000, 3 p.m.
New York

Chairman: U Mya Than ..... (Myanmar)

The meeting was called to order at 3.30 p.m.

Agenda items 65 to 81 (*continued*)

Action on all draft resolutions submitted under all items

The Chairman: As I mentioned at the Committee's meeting on Friday, 27 October 2000, the Committee will continue to take action on the draft resolutions that appear in informal working paper No.4/Rev.1 in the following sequence: in cluster 1, nuclear weapons, draft resolutions A/C.1/55/L.30, A/C.1/55/L.32/Rev.1, A/C.1/55/L.37, A/C.1/55/L.41, A/C.1/55/L.48; and in cluster 3, outer space (disarmament aspects), A/C.1/55/L.25. In cluster 4, conventional weapons, A/C.1/55/L.11/Rev.1 is not yet ready for action so has been postponed; and in cluster 6, confidence-building measures, including transparency in armaments, A/C.1/55/L.43 is not yet ready for action either.

I call now on those delegations wishing to introduce revised draft resolutions.

Mr. Salander (Sweden): I have the honour to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.4/Rev.1, entitled "Towards a nuclear-weapon-free world: the need for a new agenda", originally introduced on 23 October. In the past couple of weeks the sponsors of this draft resolution have engaged in consultations with a number of interested delegations in an effort to take into account their various views and suggestions. Accordingly, the sponsors have made some drafting changes, almost exclusively in the preambular part of the draft resolution. These drafting changes do not change the substantive thrust of the draft resolution.

On behalf of all the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.4/Rev.1, I express the hope that the draft resolution will receive the widest possible support.

Mr. Noboru (Japan): I should like to make some remarks in introducing one draft resolution and one draft decision.

First, the draft resolution is contained in document A/C.1/55/L.39/Rev.1. Its sponsors, Australia and Japan, have conducted intensive consultations with many interested delegations, bilaterally or in small groups, and are grateful for the encouragement and understanding extended to them during the consultations, and even for the devil's advocacy.

So far as operative paragraph 9 is concerned, after intensive consultations with interested delegations, the sponsors are pleased to present, in document A/C.1/55/L.39/Rev.1, a formulation to replace the original text.

Concerning operative paragraph 8, the spirit of cooperation in the consultations made it possible to retain the original text, but for the sake of fairness it should be noted that this paragraph, or its elements, triggered some animated discussion. The sponsors appreciate the positive contribution that these discussions made to their better understanding of the sensitivity that the paragraph and its elements may entail.

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room C-178. Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum.

00-71664 (E)

With these remarks the sponsors submit the draft resolution to the First Committee for action.

Secondly, the draft decision on small arms is contained in document A/C.1/55/L.28/Rev.1. I introduce it on behalf of the following sponsors: Australia, Bangladesh, Belgium, Bulgaria, Cameroon, Canada, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, El Salvador, Finland, France, Guatemala, Greece, Hungary, Israel, Kyrgyzstan, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Mali, Mozambique, the Netherlands, the Niger, the Philippines, Poland, the Republic of Korea, Romania, Sierra Leone, Swaziland, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tonga, Turkey, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America, Zambia and Japan.

Japan introduced a draft resolution on small arms for the first time in 1995. Since then the international community's awareness of the problems concerning small arms has grown remarkably. Many initiatives have been taken, and activities are being carried out at international, regional and national levels to tackle the issue of the excessive and destabilizing accumulation and transfer of small arms and light weapons. Japan welcomes such developments and is also pleased to see that the United Nations has been actively engaged in this issue. Particularly in response to two General Assembly resolutions adopted in 1995 and 1997, and with the assistance of the Panel of Governmental Experts, chaired by Ambassador Donowaki of Japan, the Secretary-General submitted his valuable reports on small arms to the General Assembly in 1997 and 1999. The General Assembly endorsed those reports and their recommendations by an overwhelming majority.

One of the recommendations in the reports was to convene an international conference on small arms. Last year the General Assembly, by adopting resolution 54/54 V, confirmed the recommendation to convene the United Nations Conference on the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects in July 2001.

This year my Government decided to introduce a short procedural draft decision on small arms instead of a draft resolution. The thinking behind this is that the process of preparation for the United Nations Conference to deal with this issue is under way on the basis of previous resolutions and that this year's session of the First Committee could better serve the purpose of helping the process by not in any way prejudging the substantive discussions and the outcome of the Conference. Draft decision A/C.1/55/L.28/Rev.1 deals with three issues only — the venue and date of the Conference and the venue of the third session of its Preparatory Committee.

As Under-Secretary-General Jayantha Dhanapala rightly pointed out in his opening statement, an early decision on the venue and date of the United Nations Conference is urgently required. A delayed decision causes further delay in the preparatory work by the Secretariat, and by the many Governments concerned, on the substance.

Document A/C.1/55/L.28/Rev.1 is the outcome of consultations held since the last session of the First Committee. I wish to express my appreciation for the support and cooperation given to me by the Chairman of the Preparatory Committee, Ambassador Santos of Mozambique, all delegations concerned and the United Nations Secretariat. Furthermore, I wish to pay tribute in particular to the Government of Switzerland for its generous offer made earlier and for the flexibility shown last week, which facilitated our work.

As to the venue of the third session of the Preparatory Committee, my delegation understands that, after consultations, the Government of Kenya has withdrawn its offer to host the meeting in Nairobi. My delegation appreciates also the flexibility demonstrated by the Government of Kenya.

The 2001 Conference is the first major United Nations conference in the field of disarmament since the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, which was held in 1988. It is my sincere hope that the remaining procedural issues, such as the presidency of the Conference, will be resolved as soon as possible so as to enable the Preparatory Committee to expedite its substantive work with a view to the successful conclusion of the Conference.

It is the wish of the sponsors that draft decision A/C.1/55/L.28/Rev.1 be adopted by the Committee without a vote.

Mr. Westdal (Canada): I should like formally to present to the First Committee draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.49/Rev.1, entitled "The Conference on Disarmament decision (CD/1547) of 11 August 1998 to establish, under item 1 of its agenda entitled 'Cessation

of the nuclear-arms race and nuclear disarmament', an ad hoc committee to negotiate, on the basis of the report of the Special Coordinator (CD/1299) and the mandate contained therein, a non-discriminatory, multilateral and internationally and effectively verifiable treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices".

The title has 73 words. They make too long an acronym even for a First Committee hand. I have tried pronouncing it, but it sounds like some destination in Wales and is quite beyond me.

The draft resolution is derived directly from resolution 53/77 I of 4 December 1998, adopted without a vote by this Committee and the General Assembly. It has been adapted to take into account the outcome of the 2000 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) and consultations here at this session. We all know that this text has a long, difficult history and that complex negotiations lie ahead. It is not the purpose of this draft resolution to review that history or to prejudge either the structure or the result of those negotiations. The draft resolution is, rather, strictly procedural, anchored firmly in the realities and the expectations of the international community. Our view is that attempts to amend the text would raise substantive issues better reserved for the Conference on Disarmament.

Canada values the draft resolution because it expresses the determination that all together we might conclude a multilateral and internationally and effectively verifiable treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices. Such a treaty, to stop making the stuff of nuclear bombs, is fundamental in both disarmament and non-proliferation. We thus much hope this draft resolution will be adopted without amendment and without a vote.

The draft resolution is open for co-sponsorship. My colleague, Mr. Henrichon, is in this room with the sponsorship sheet. We welcome all who wish to join us in this expression of security interests that we consider to be fundamental.

Mr. Fernandes (Brazil): I have asked for the floor in order to introduce the revised version of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.19, on the nuclear-weapon-free southern hemisphere and adjacent areas. The revised text is the result of consultations among sponsors and interested delegations. Some delegations suggested that the reference to the international conference and its aim in operative paragraph 6 be more clearly specified. Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.19/Rev.1 contains modifications in operative paragraph 6 in line with those concerns.

With a view to underlining the non-prescriptive character in which the idea of an international conference is presented, and to emphasize its status as only a possibility, we added the expression "might be held". The verb tense speaks for itself. At the same time the last six words of operative paragraph 6 in the original version, "can help in promoting these objectives", were replaced by an expression that we believe clarifies the purpose of such a conference if and when it is convened. First, the notion that the conference would promote the objectives of nuclear-weapon-free zones has been replaced by that of support. Second, the aim of the conference has been clarified with the introduction of the more precise wording "to support the common goals envisaged in those treaties". That choice of words comes from operative paragraph 5, where the expression "common goals envisaged in those treaties" has been present without objection for five years.

I wish to underline that it is the opinion of the sponsors that supporting the common goals envisaged in the nuclear-weapon-free zone treaties is something that we hope the overwhelming majority of delegations can continue to support. With these changes aimed at showing flexibility and willingness to adapt the text in response to the comments presented to us, we hope that the draft resolution will continue to enjoy the broadest possible support.

Mr. Antonov (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): On behalf of the sponsors of the draft resolution entitled "Preservation of and compliance with the Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems", the Republic of Belarus, China and the Russian Federation, I wish to introduce the revised draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/55/L.2/Rev.1.

The revised draft resolution has one change from the original draft, the inclusion of a new operative paragraph 7, which

> "*Welcomes* the decision taken by the United States of America on 1 September 2000 not to

authorize deployment of a national missile defence at this time, and considers that it constitutes a positive step for the preservation of strategic stability and security".

The revision was made as a result of discussion of the matter in the First Committee and also as a result of consultations with regional groups and interested countries. The revision is purely factual in nature, and its inclusion in the draft resolution once again emphasizes that the text is not confrontational and is not directed against any State whatever. We are confident that Member States of the United Nations have but one choice: to vote in favour of this draft resolution, and in so doing to preserve the basis of the process for strengthening the strategic stability of nuclear disarmament and the non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction in the twenty-first century. The strengthening of strategic stability, the core of which is the Treaty in question, is not the prerogative of just certain countries and can be ensured only through the collective efforts of the international community. Our draft in its present form has broad support from the international community. We will not be making any further additions to the draft resolution and are ready for a decision to be adopted on it on 1 November.

The Chairman: I now call on delegations wishing to make general statements or comments on draft resolutions contained in cluster 1, nuclear weapons.

Mr. De la Fortelle (France) (*spoke in French*): It is my honour to speak on behalf of the European Union on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.37, entitled "Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty". The countries of Central and Eastern Europe associated with the European Union — Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia — and the associated countries Cyprus and Malta, as well as Norway as a European Free Trade Association country and member of the European Economic Area, associate themselves with this statement.

The member States of the European Union fully support draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.37, on the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT), introduced last Monday by Australia.

The importance and urgency of pursuing the process of signing and ratifying this Treaty in order to allow its entry into force as soon as possible was recalled in the Final Document of the Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). For the European Union this is a priority. No fewer than 160 States have signed this fundamental instrument in the areas of disarmament and of nuclear non-proliferation. We urge all States that have not yet done so, in particular those among the 44 States whose ratification is necessary for the Treaty to enter into force, to sign and ratify the CTBT immediately. Here we welcome its ratification by Bangladesh, Chile, Iceland, Gabon, Kiribati, Lithuania, Maldives, Mexico, Morocco, the Russian Federation, Turkey and the United Arab Emirates, which have ratified it since the last session of the General Assembly. All member States of the European Union, including those on the list of the 44 States whose ratification is necessary for the entry into force of the Treaty, have signed and ratified the CTBT. The European Union has spared no effort to have the Treaty enter into force promptly and for it to have universal scope. On 29 July 1999 the European Union adopted a common position to move towards these goals.

During the Conference held in Vienna last year under article XIV of the CTBT, those countries that had signed and ratified the Treaty reaffirmed their determination to work to have the Treaty ratified by all and for it to quickly enter into force. The European Union emphasizes that it fully supports the efforts made by the Preparatory Commission for the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty Organization so that the verification regime of the Treaty will be established early and effectively.

The European Union hopes that all Members of the United Nations will be in a position to support this important draft resolution on the CTBT.

Mr. Mesdoua (Algeria) (*spoke in French*): The delegation of Algeria has asked for the floor to share its point of view on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.41, entitled "Nuclear disarmament", introduced by Myanmar. My country has been co-sponsoring such draft resolutions since the first year that one was introduced. This year, in sponsoring this draft resolution once again, Algeria, which presided over the sixth Review Conference of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), wishes once again to reiterate its unswerving support for the efforts made by the international community towards nuclear

disarmament and to reaffirm its commitment and unswerving dedication to the cause of nuclear disarmament.

Our sponsorship of this draft resolution, which fully fits within the framework of our fundamental concept of the security of all States, the advancement of which necessarily hinges on the implementation of nuclear disarmament, also attests clearly to Algeria's commitment to the collective work of nuclear disarmament, which remains an absolute priority, as has been continually reiterated by the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries. In this framework, the Group of 21, in a statement made on 21 September 2000 at the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva, once again indicated that the question of nuclear disarmament remained of the highest priority and that there was a need to establish a special committee on nuclear disarmament.

The draft resolution now before the Committee welcomes the positive outcome of the sixth NPT Review Conference, held last April, and the commitments undertaken by the nuclear States, for the first time and unequivocally, to proceed to the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals, which is a commitment under article 6 of the Treaty. We all hope to see this immediately reflected in action.

In the view of my delegation, the draft resolution's call for the holding of an international conference on nuclear disarmament at an early date to identify and deal with concrete measures of nuclear disarmament, as well as its calls for the establishment of an ad hoc committee for nuclear disarmament and for the commencement of negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament on a treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons, constitute additional reasons to support this draft resolution, and we call on all delegations to give it their fullest support.

The Chairman: At this stage, I draw the attention of the Committee to the fact that the Committee's proceedings are going smoothly, and if everything continues to go according to plan we will be able to conclude on the afternoon of 1 November. But as a number of draft resolutions have been postponed, I would ask the lead sponsors of any draft resolutions that could be ready for action tomorrow to inform the Secretariat so that the Committee would be able to take up as many draft resolutions as possible tomorrow morning.

The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.30. I call first on those representatives wishing to explain their position or vote before a decision is taken.

Mr. Akram (Pakistan): I wish to explain Pakistan's vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.30, entitled "Convention on the Prohibition of the Use of Nuclear Weapons". Pakistan has consistently sought to promote full respect for the principles and purposes of the United Nations Charter, especially the central principle contained in Article 2, paragraph 4, relating to the non-use or threat of use of force in international relations. We construe the call for the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons as being designed to uphold this central principle, the non-use or threat of use of force in international relations.

Pakistan also hopes that this principle will be reflected in all future decisions relating to the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons. We adhere to the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice on the issue of the threat or use of nuclear weapons. I note that last week the Foreign Minister of Pakistan stated that the use of nuclear weapons is inconceivable.

The Chairman: As no other delegation wishes to speak at this stage, the Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.30.

A recorded vote has been requested.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Lin Kuo-chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.30, entitled "Convention on the Prohibition of the Use of Nuclear Weapons", was introduced by the representative of India at the Committee's 16th meeting, on 17 October 2000. The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.30 are listed in the draft resolution itself and in document A/C.1/55/INF.2. In addition, the following countries have become sponsors of the draft resolution: Burkina Faso, Mauritius, Namibia and Nepal.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Benin,

Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, China, Cyprus, Georgia, Israel, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Ukraine, Uzbekistan

Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.30 was adopted by 101 votes to 42, with 14 abstentions.

The Chairman: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes or positions on the draft resolution just adopted.

Mr. Noboru (Japan): I should like to explain Japan's abstention in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.30, entitled "Convention on the Prohibition of the Use of Nuclear Weapons". It goes without saying that nuclear weapons should never be used again. The total elimination of such weapons should be achieved at the earliest possible date and continuous efforts should be made towards that goal. As far as draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.30 is concerned, Japan is of the view that in order to realize the total elimination of nuclear weapons the only way open to us, in the present international reality, is to make steady, step-by-step progress in nuclear non-proliferation and nuclear disarmament. In this connection, Japan recognizes more immediacy and more practicality in taking practical steps such as those Japan specified in its draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.39/Rev.1 than in the measure envisaged in draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.30.

Ms. Crittenberger (United States of America): I have asked for the floor to explain the United States vote on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.30, entitled "Convention on the Prohibition of the Use of Nuclear Weapons". As we do each year with similar draft resolutions, the United States voted no on this draft resolution. Notwithstanding our commitment to nuclear disarmament, this is not the type of convention that the United States would ever negotiate, approve or sign. Such a convention is simply not a practical approach to the total elimination of nuclear weapons. The considerable progress towards that goal that has been achieved to date has been made by a realistic, step-by-step process that embraces bilateral, unilateral and multilateral measures. My delegation is convinced that this process can continue to bear fruit in the years ahead, and, in the light of the successful outcome of the year 2000 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), this draft resolution's relevance has decreased further.

The Chairman: As no other delegation wishes to speak at this stage, the Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.32/Rev.1.

If no representatives wish to explain their position or vote before action is taken, the Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.32/Rev.1.

A recorded vote has been requested.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Lin Kuo-chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.32/Rev.1, entitled "Reducing nuclear danger", was introduced by the representative of India at the Committee's 18th meeting, on 19 October 2000. The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.32/Rev.1 are listed in the draft resolution itself. In addition, the following countries have become sponsors of the draft resolution: Cuba and Namibia.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Russian Federation, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Argentina, Armenia, Brazil, China, Georgia, Israel, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Paraguay, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Ukraine, Uzbekistan

Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.32/Rev.1 was adopted by 102 votes to 42, with 14 abstentions.

The Chairman: I now call upon those representatives who wish to explain their vote on the draft resolution just adopted.

Ms. Crittenberger (United States of America): The United States voted no on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.32/Rev.1, entitled "Reducing nuclear danger", because it is unrealistic and fails to acknowledge the real progress being made on unilateral, bilateral and multilateral fronts to reduce nuclear dangers. The cold war and the nuclear arms race are becoming increasingly distant memories. Unilateral and bilateral efforts over the past decade have reduced the size of nuclear arsenals. Globally there is less possibility of a nuclear exchange involving the five nuclear-weapon States than at any other time over the past 50 years.

This impractical draft resolution will do nothing to promote nuclear disarmament. Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.32/Rev.1 even fails to mention the successful outcome of the year 2000 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons as if it never happened. The fact is the Review Conference did happen, and did succeed in adopting substantial, agreed and practical steps for nuclear non-proliferation and nuclear disarmament that will reduce nuclear dangers. Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.32/Rev.1 will not.

We also note that draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.32/Rev.1 embraces the Millennium Summit Declaration's call to consider the

> "possibility of convening an international conference to identify ways of eliminating nuclear dangers." (*resolution 55/2, United*

Nations Millennium Declaration, para. 9, ninth subparagraph)

The United States continues to believe that now is not the time to convene such a conference and considers it to be an unfortunate coincidence that the title of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.32/Rev.1 and the language in the Millennium Summit Declaration calling for consideration of such a conference are similarly worded, even if their objectives might be different. Basing an international conference on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.32/Rev.1 in any way would only increase our concerns about both. If it is necessary to consider a conference on nuclear issues, we should focus our efforts on a fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament with balanced agenda objectives, and the United States was pleased to join in the adoption of that draft resolution without a vote.

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.37. I call first on those representatives wishing to explain their position or vote before a decision is taken.

Mr. Akram (Pakistan): I should like to explain our vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.37, entitled "Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty" (CTBT).

Pakistan considers that the CTBT is a good Treaty, and, as the Foreign Minister of Pakistan stated last week, we believe that it would be in Pakistan's interests to sign it. With regard to operative paragraph 3, calling for the maintenance of moratoria on nuclear testing, I would like to say that Pakistan was not the first to test nuclear weapons and will not be the first to resume nuclear testing. Pakistan has declared a unilateral moratorium on further testing. We will maintain that moratorium until the entry into force of the CTBT. Of course, the moratorium will have to be reviewed in case there is an extraordinary development in our region. Also, Pakistan will not be the country that will stand in the way of the entry into force of the CTBT.

With regard to the call in operative paragraph 4, in 1996 Pakistan voted in favour of the CTBT. However, following our nuclear tests, which we were obliged to carry out in 1998 to restore strategic balance in South Asia in the interests of our security and of peace and stability in our region, regrettably, some important countries imposed sanctions against Pakistan. Pakistan resents these sanctions and has always maintained that they must be removed. Pakistan has also stated in the past that we could sign the Treaty if the coercive atmosphere were to be removed.

It is natural that the Government of Pakistan must remain sensitive to its own public opinion. We would therefore have to await the evolution of a broad consensus in order to realize our desire to sign the CTBT. We hope that our friends in the international community will help Pakistan to realize that desire.

The Chairman: The Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.37.

A recorded vote has been requested.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Lin Kuo-chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.37, entitled "Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty", was introduced by the representative of Australia at the Committee's 21st meeting, on 23 October 2000. The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.37 are listed in the draft resolution itself and in document A/C.1/55/INF.2.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lesotho, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated

States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Bhutan, India, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mauritius, Syrian Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania

Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.37 was adopted by 149 votes to none, with 7 abstentions.

The Chairman: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes or positions on the draft resolution just adopted.

Mr. Mekdad (Syrian Arab Republic) (*spoke in Arabic*): My delegation abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.37, entitled "Comprehensive Nuclear-Test Ban Treaty" (CTBT), because Syria has consistently stressed that a treaty as significant and sensitive as the CTBT, with its future obligations on all member States, should not under any circumstances disregard the legitimate concerns of the non-nuclear-weapon States, which constitute the overwhelming majority of countries in the world. Those States have received no guarantees against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons, nor are they allowed to acquire the advanced technology, in all its forms, so essential to accelerate the pace of national development.

The thrust of the many substantive and fair remarks made regarding the CTBT has been that the Treaty contains no provisions that show a commitment by the nuclear-weapon States to phase out their nuclear arsenals within a reasonable period of time. Nor do the provisions explicitly state that it is illegal to use or threaten to use nuclear weapons. It does not stress the need to achieve the universality of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) in order to put an end to all aspects of such proliferation. The thrust of those remarks has also been that the provision is exclusive to the maintenance of a moratorium on nuclear weapons tests and not nuclear laboratory tests or the qualitative development of nuclear weapons and the production of new types of such weapons. Those remarks have also stressed that the on-site verification and inspection system might open the door for abuse of the national data provided by the national surveillance systems and that this data would be arbitrarily used for purposes of political expediency. The most bizarre provision in the Treaty is that States that have already signed the Treaty might take measures against countries that have not yet signed, which could include measures taken by the Security Council under Chapter VII of the Charter. That indeed is a violation of the sovereign right of States to accede or not to accede to any treaty.

The Syrian Arab Republic views those substantive loopholes with very grave concern indeed. Syria completely rejects the inclusion of Israel in the countries of the Middle East and South Asia. The current situation in the Middle East is volatile, and Israel is the only country possessing nuclear weapons and all other forms of weapons of mass destruction, and it is also working to develop such weapons quantitatively and qualitatively. Furthermore, Israel refuses to accede to the NPT and to place its nuclear facilities under the International Atomic Energy Agency verification and control system. All that impedes — indeed, jeopardizes — ongoing efforts to establish a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East and makes our region and the entire world vulnerable to the Israeli nuclear threats without any tangible international reaction.

Mr. Bar (Israel): Israel signed the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT) in September 1996. That decision reflects its long-standing policy and willingness to be involved in the non-proliferation efforts of the international community in a responsible and serious manner, with due consideration to its security situation. Israel played an active role throughout the negotiations on the Treaty in Geneva and contributed politically and conceptually

to the drafting of the Treaty. Since the establishment of the Preparatory Commission in November 1996, Israel has played a major part in the endeavour to develop the elements of the CTBT verification regime, including the practical procedure to be adopted in the operational manuals by which the Treaty will be implemented.

Israel decided to vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.37 because of the importance it attaches to the CTBT, notwithstanding reservations regarding some of the wording in operative paragraph 1.

We would like to clarify Israel's position as follows. The CTBT is governed exclusively by its policy-making organs, particularly the Preparatory Commission. The relevant Preparatory Commission resolution differs significantly from the draft resolution before us. Operative paragraph 1 of this draft resolution omits crucial conditions and prerequisites required for the ratification of the Treaty as determined by the CTBT text itself. For example, in article IV, paragraph 1, the Treaty states, inter alia, "At entry into force of this Treaty, the verification regime shall be capable of meeting the verification requirements of this Treaty."

In view of Israel's active role in this Treaty, we are looking forward to future consultations with all the relevant countries on the drafting of next year's resolution. This, we hope, will lead to a text that Israel could not only support without reservations but could also co-sponsor.

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.41. I call first on those representatives wishing to explain their position or vote before a decision is taken.

Mr. Coutts (Chile) (*spoke in Spanish*): On draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.41, entitled "Nuclear disarmament", we wish to express our forceful rejection of those policies that still intend to keep us under the looming threat of nuclear weapons. We hear constant double-talk from those States that call rhetorically for a reduction in such weapons on the one hand, while at the same time not even taking into account the recommendations of the International Court of Justice on the need to undertake negotiations on this subject in good faith. By the same token, the breakdown of debate in the context of the Conference on Disarmament on this issue, the various interpretations of deterrence and strategic doctrines that keep alive the nuclear option and States that want to join an arms race in this arena are elements that together generate a climate of great instability and lack of confidence.

Chile, together with the rest of the Latin American countries, is part of a nuclear-weapon-free zone, having signed the Common Market of the South peace accord. We want to build a climate marked by trust and arms limitation. That is why we find it incomprehensible and frustrating that in the nuclear disarmament arena we cannot make greater and faster strides, and considering also that most of the world is practically disarmed.

Although this draft resolution contains certain aspects that do not fully convince us, we agree with its basic concepts, including the importance of the principle of irreversibility in the process of nuclear disarmament and other related arms control and reduction measures. For these reasons we will vote in favour of this draft resolution.

Mr. Akram (Pakistan): I am taking the floor to explain Pakistan's position before the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.41, entitled "Nuclear disarmament". Such draft resolutions have traditionally reflected the views of the broad majority of the non-aligned countries on nuclear disarmament. Pakistan co-sponsored these draft resolutions until the fifty-third session of the General Assembly. Last year the draft resolution omitted some important provisions relating to a step-by-step process of nuclear disarmament. Therefore, we did not co-sponsor it, although we voted in favour of the draft resolution last year.

This year, unfortunately, we note a further weakening in the provisions of the draft resolution. In particular, the draft resolution in A/C.1/55/L.41, unlike last year's, omits reference to important proposals made by 28 delegations in the Conference on Disarmament, members of the Group of 21, for a programme of action for the elimination of nuclear weapons, and another proposal by 26 delegations in the Conference on Disarmament, members of the Group of 21, proposing a comprehensive mandate for an ad hoc committee on nuclear disarmament. Furthermore, Pakistan cannot endorse the provisions of the new operative paragraph 9 welcoming the positive outcome of the 2000 Review Conference of the States Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear

Weapons, for reasons that we explained in detail in my statement on 23 October in this Committee.

For these reasons, the Pakistan delegation will be constrained to abstain in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.41, entitled "Nuclear disarmament".

The Chairman: The Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.41.

The Committee will first take a decision on operative paragraph 9 of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.41.

A separate, recorded vote on operative paragraph 9 has also been requested.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Lin Kuo-chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.41, entitled "Nuclear disarmament", was introduced by the representative of Myanmar at the Committee's 21st meeting, on 23 October 2000. The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.41 are listed in the draft resolution itself and in document A/C.1/55/INF.2.

The Committee will now proceed to vote on operative paragraph 9, which reads as follows:

> "*Welcomes* the positive outcome of the 2000 Review Conference of the States Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and the unequivocal undertaking by the nuclear-weapon States, in the Final Document of the Conference, to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals leading to nuclear disarmament, to which all States Parties are committed under Article 6 of the Treaty and the reaffirmation by the States Parties that the total elimination of nuclear weapons is the only absolute guarantee against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons, and calls for the full and effective implementation of the steps set out in the Final Document".

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Moldova, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

India, Israel

Abstaining:

Bulgaria, Cuba, Estonia, France, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Pakistan, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Operative paragraph 9 of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.41 was retained by 139 votes to 2, with 16 abstentions.

The Chairman: The Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.41 as a whole.

A recorded vote has been requested.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Lin Kuo-chung (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now vote on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.41 as a whole.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Cyprus, Georgia, India, Ireland, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Pakistan, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, San Marino, Sweden, Ukraine, Uzbekistan

Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.41 as a whole was adopted by 99 votes to 39, with 17 abstentions.

The Chairman: I call now on those representatives who wish to explain their positions or votes on the draft resolution just adopted.

Mr. Noboru (Japan): I should like to explain Japan's abstention in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.41, entitled "Nuclear disarmament". As I stated in my explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.30, it is Japan's fervent desire and its firm belief that the use of nuclear weapons should not be repeated and that continuous efforts should be made towards a world free of nuclear weapons. Having said that, as far as draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.41 is concerned I should like to state that my delegation recognized last year some improvements in the content of this draft resolution, and this year we are aware of further improvements.

First, it rightly contains a reference to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) as a cornerstone of nuclear non-proliferation and nuclear disarmament. My delegation also appreciates that this year's draft resolution welcomes the final outcome of the 2000 NPT Review Conference and incorporates some agreed points of nuclear disarmament from the Final Document of that Review Conference. However, the draft resolution does not command the full support of my Government. One reason is that it still contains the elements of an agreed time-frame for nuclear disarmament in the fifth preambular paragraph.

The idea of an international conference on nuclear disarmament, mentioned in operative paragraph 16, is unclear and seems to be an overlap because we had the 2000 NPT Review Conference just a few months ago, and the NPT review process will continue. I also wish to point out that the possibility of convening an international conference to identify ways of eliminating nuclear dangers based on the proposal of the Secretary-General of the United Nations, on the one hand, and the idea of convening the fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament dealing with all aspects of disarmament, on the other, are still to be discussed in the United Nations.

Mr. Mukul (India): My delegation has asked to speak after the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.41, entitled "Nuclear disarmament", to state that my country, in view of its long-standing and unwavering commitment to nuclear disarmament and the elimination of nuclear weapons globally has supported such draft resolutions in the past. We are, however, disappointed at the turn this draft resolution has taken. This year's draft resolution has diluted a number of traditional, long-held Non-Aligned Movement and Group of 21 positions on nuclear disarmament which my country fully supports.

Further, our views regarding the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons are well known. Therefore, we called for and cast a negative vote on operative paragraph 9 while abstaining in the voting on the draft resolution as a whole.

Mr. Wu Haitao (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): The Chinese delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.41, entitled "Nuclear disarmament", introduced by the representative of Myanmar on behalf of some of the non-aligned countries. We support the principles and purposes of this draft resolution. On the question of nuclear disarmament, China shares much common ground with the non-aligned countries, including the following: we are all in favour of the complete prohibition of and total elimination of nuclear weapons; we are all against the policy of nuclear deterrence characterized by the first use of nuclear weapons; and we are all in favour of the early commencement of negotiations to conclude an international legal instrument on assurances of non-use and non-threat of use of nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon States and nuclear-weapon-free zones.

In the view of the Chinese delegation, in order to attain at an early date the objective of the complete prohibition and total elimination of nuclear weapons, apart from the measures mentioned in the draft resolution, we should also take note of the following. First, the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty is the cornerstone for maintaining the international strategic balance and stability, promoting nuclear disarmament and preventing nuclear proliferation. It is essential to call upon all States parties to observe this Treaty comprehensively and strictly.

Secondly, the country with the largest and most advanced nuclear arsenal should take the lead and further reduce its nuclear weapons on a large scale. This will not only be conducive to the further improvement of the international security environment but will also create conditions for other nuclear-weapon States to join in the process of nuclear disarmament.

Thirdly, measures such as nuclear transparency should be based on the wider international environment of peace, security, stability and confidence. They should be linked with the process of nuclear disarmament and should not compromise the safety and security of the countries concerned.

Mr. Borrie (New Zealand): I have taken the floor today to provide an explanation of New Zealand's vote on Myanmar's draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.41, on nuclear disarmament.

The text of this draft resolution continues to evolve in a positive direction from New Zealand's perspective. We regard the endorsement of the outcomes of the 2000 Review Conference of the States Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) and the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice as particularly welcome elements. However, there are still a few aspects of the draft resolution where it is necessary to clarify our views. For instance, we do not regard ourselves as being bound by the preambular references to meetings of the Non-Aligned Movement.

New Zealand agrees on the necessity of establishing an appropriate subsidiary body in the Conference on Disarmament with a mandate to deal with nuclear disarmament. There was a clear call for this in the Final Document of the NPT Review Conference. As a sponsor of the draft resolution entitled "Towards a nuclear-weapon-free world: the need for a new agenda", we have urged the Conference on Disarmament to agree on a programme of work that includes the immediate establishment of such a body.

New Zealand also regrets that the Conference on Disarmament has been unable to establish a subsidiary body on nuclear disarmament, but that regret is not confined only to nuclear disarmament. Another no less important priority for the Conference is the resumption of negotiations on banning the production of fissile material. Therefore, while we can support the draft resolution this year, we think that its references to the Conference on Disarmament are rather too prescriptive in view of the realities of the negotiations that have

been continuing in the Conference on Disarmament on a programme of work.

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.48. I call first on those representatives wishing to explain their position or vote before a decision is taken.

Mr. An Myong Hun (Democratic People's Republic of Korea): The delegation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea would like to express its views on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.48.

It is clear that the existence of nuclear weapons will remain the greatest threat to humankind in the twenty-first century. Therefore, it is also clear that the total elimination of nuclear weapons should continue to be a priority in addressing the issues of disarmament and international security as a whole. The United Nations and its Member States have affirmed and reaffirmed the commitment to the goal of the total elimination of nuclear weapons, and we all have the obligation to work together towards that goal. We believe that the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice stands by this commitment and obligation. It is time that we saw the practicality of fulfilling the multilateral obligation towards this goal. We hope that this draft resolution will serve to bring an early commencement of multilateral negotiations leading to the fulfilment of the expressed commitment for nuclear disarmament.

Mr. Coutts (Chile) (*spoke in Spanish*): Chile attaches great importance to international law and therefore to the advisory opinions of the International Court of Justice. Regarding the question before us, the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice on the *Legality of the Threat or Use of Nuclear Weapons* is a solid and necessary theoretical basis. It is obvious that because of their devastating and far-reaching effects, nuclear weapons can cause enormous damage. The advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice therefore establishes an important and necessary link between disarmament law and humanitarian law. International law, including Article 1 of the United Nations Charter, gives the international community the obligation to maintain international peace and security, and to that end the use or threat of use of these weapons must be banned for they create instability. The simple possession of these weapons in a climate of hostility can bring about the threat of the use of force, which is forbidden by Article 2, paragraph 4, of the United Nations Charter, as well as article 52 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, which has this as a binding and incontrovertible rule.

The draft resolution demands the practice of preventive diplomacy, which would make it possible to define the necessary legal framework to guide political efforts in order to prevent actions that would irreversibly upset relations among States.

For these reasons, Chile firmly believes that the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice forms an unquestionable and necessary conceptual basis for progress towards cooperation based on trust in order to avoid threats of conflict that could have catastrophic consequences for mankind.

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.48.

The Committee will first take a decision on operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.48.

A separate, recorded vote on operative paragraph 1 has been requested.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Lin Kuo-chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.48, entitled "Follow-up to the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice on the *Legality of the Threat or Use of Nuclear Weapons*", was introduced by the representative of Malaysia at the Committee's 18th meeting, on 19 October 2000. The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.48 are listed in the draft resolution itself and in document A/C.1/55/INF.2. In addition, the following countries have become sponsors of the draft resolution: Bolivia, Egypt, Grenada, Honduras, Jamaica, Kuwait, Lesotho, Namibia, the Niger, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Suriname, Uruguay and Vanuatu.

The Committee will now vote on operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.48, which reads as follows:

> "*Underlines once again* the unanimous conclusion of the International Court of Justice that there exists an obligation to pursue in good faith and bring to a conclusion negotiations

leading to nuclear disarmament in all its aspects under strict and effective international control".

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

France, Israel, Russian Federation, United States of America

Abstaining:

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.48 was retained by 150 votes to 4, with 1 abstention.

The Chairman: The Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.48 as a whole.

A recorded vote has been requested.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Lin Kuo-chung (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now vote on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.48 as a whole.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Andorra, Belgium, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Monaco, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Slovenia,

Spain, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan

Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.48 as a whole was adopted by 109 votes to 27, with 21 abstentions.

The Chairman: I now call on those representatives who wish to explain their positions or votes on the draft resolution just adopted.

Mr. Noboru (Japan): I should like to explain Japan's abstention in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.48, entitled "Follow-up to the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice on the *Legality of the Threat or Use of Nuclear Weapons*".

As I stated in my explanations of vote on draft resolutions A/C.1/55/L.30 and A/C.1/55/L.41, nuclear weapons should never be used again, and continuous efforts should be made towards a world free of nuclear weapons. Japan believes that because of their immense power to cause destruction, and death and injury to human beings, the use of nuclear weapons is clearly contrary to the basic humanitarianism that gives international law its philosophical foundation. Indeed, the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice, which this draft resolution addresses, demonstrates the complexity of the subject. Japan supports the unanimous opinion of the judges of the Court on the existing obligation under international law to pursue nuclear disarmament and to conclude negotiations on that matter in good faith. Japan firmly believes that we must take concrete measures to make steady and step-by-step progress in nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament.

From that point of view, Japan submitted draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.39/Rev.1, which addresses practical steps with a view to realizing the total elimination of nuclear weapons. In Japan's view, such practical steps should be pursued with intensity before jumping to the negotiations that draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.48 calls upon all States to commence.

Mr. Millim (Luxembourg) (*spoke in French*): It is my honour to speak on behalf of the three Benelux countries — Belgium, the Netherlands and Luxembourg — as well as Denmark, Germany, Greece, Italy, Norway, Portugal and Spain, regarding the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.48. Our 10 countries welcome the support that this draft resolution provides for nuclear disarmament, since its ultimate goal is the complete elimination of nuclear weapons.

Our countries supported operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution because we welcome with satisfaction and support the unanimous conclusion of the International Court of Justice cited in that paragraph. However, we cannot support the draft resolution as a whole since we believe that nuclear disarmament can be implemented only through a gradual process. The States parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) reached agreement on a number of specific measures in the Final Document of the most recent Review Conference of the NPT. We believe that in years to come the efforts of the international community should be focused on the implementation of those specific measures.

Mr. Grey (United States of America): The United States voted no on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.48 as a whole, as well as in the separate voting on paragraph 1. This draft resolution employs the 1996 advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice as a justification to call for negotiations on a nuclear-weapons convention. The United States position on this draft resolution has not changed. We oppose it because we remain convinced that the step-by-step process that is under way encompasses unilateral, bilateral and multilateral efforts, including of course the successful 2000 Review Conference of the States Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), that are yielding significant results in the area of nuclear disarmament. This step-by-step process remains for the time being the only realistic approach in this highly complex field.

In any event, the Court's advisory opinion is advisory only and is not binding. As ongoing unilateral and bilateral efforts continue to make real progress in reducing nuclear weapons, another multilateral role can be played. The long-awaited negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament on the fissile material cut-off treaty should begin in January 2001.

The United States takes very seriously its NPT article VI obligations and reaffirmed them in the context of the 2000 NPT Review Conference Final Document. The Court's advisory opinion that there exists an obligation to bring to a conclusion negotiations on nuclear disarmament does not alter the substance of article VI duty in any way, since the responsibility to pursue negotiations in good faith inherently involves seeking a successful conclusion to negotiations.

The Chairman: We will now proceed to cluster 3. If no delegations wish to make general statements or comments on draft resolutions contained in cluster 3, outer space (disarmament aspects), the Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.25.

If no delegations wish to explain their position or vote before a decision is taken, the Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.25.

A recorded vote has been requested.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Lin Kuo-chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.25, entitled "Prevention of an arms race in outer space", was introduced by the representative of Egypt at the Committee's 18th meeting, on 19 October 2000. The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.25 are listed in the draft resolution itself and in document A/C.1/55/INF.2. In addition, the following countries have become sponsors of the draft resolution: Malaysia and Togo.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of) Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Israel, United States of America

Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.25 was adopted by 154 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

The Chairman: I now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes or positions on the draft resolution just adopted.

Mr. De la Fortelle (France) (*spoke in French*): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the European Union and the associated countries of Central and Eastern Europe — Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia — as well as the associated countries Cyprus, Malta and Turkey. Our delegations voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.25, but it seems to me to be necessary to specify the significance of our vote in order to avoid any misunderstanding in the context of the Conference on Disarmament.

Everyone is aware that preventing an arms race in outer space was among the elements that were discussed at great length in the context of the unfortunately fruitless efforts to arrive at the consensus necessary for the resumption of substantive work in the Conference on Disarmament. We are prepared to support the setting up of a subsidiary body under the Conference on Disarmament on this subject. The nature and mandate of that body would have to gain the assent of everyone. The prospects opened by the successive Chairmen of the Conference on Disarmament afford us in this connection a sound premise on which to work. We should like, nonetheless, to recall that negotiations at the Conference on Disarmament on a non-discriminatory, universal treaty to ban the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons and other nuclear devices are a priority for the European Union.

In conclusion, may I make a further clarification. Turkey was one of the countries on behalf of which I had the honour to speak a short while ago in support of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.37, on the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty. Please accept my apologies for that omission.

The Chairman: Before adjourning the meeting I should like to remind delegations, that bearing in mind our aim to finish the work of the Committee on 1 November, only three meetings remain to act upon the remaining draft resolutions, on Tuesday, 31 October 2000, and Wednesday, 1 November 2000. I urge delegations, therefore, to be ready and to inform the Secretariat in a timely manner so that the Committee is able to take action on the remaining draft resolutions.

The meeting rose at 5.10 p.m.

United Nations A/C.1/55/PV.26

General Assembly
Fifty-fifth session

Official Records

First Committee
26th meeting
Tuesday, 31 October 2000, 10 a.m.
New York

Chairman: U Mya Than ..... (Myanmar)

The meeting was called to order at 10.25 a.m.

Agenda items 65 to 81 (*continued*)

Action on all draft resolutions submitted under all items

The Chairman: As I mentioned at the Committee's meeting yesterday, Monday, 30 October 2000, the Committee will continue to take decisions on the draft resolutions that appear in information working paper No.5/Rev.1 in the following sequence: in cluster 1, nuclear weapons, draft resolutions A/C.1/55/L.1/Rev.1, A/C.1/55/L.19/Rev.1; in cluster 2, other weapons of mass destruction, draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.42; and in cluster 10, international security, draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.47/Rev.1. In addition, if there is no objection, the Committee will also take action on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.28, on small arms, because an oral statement on the programme budget implications of that draft resolution is now ready to be made.

I call now on those delegations wishing to introduce revised draft resolutions.

Mr. Čalovski (the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia): In introducing draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.47/Rev.1, I should like to make a brief statement.

We have made three changes to draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.47/Rev.1. In the ninth preambular paragraph we have added a reference to the Skopje statement so that the paragraph will read as follows:

"*Noting also* the importance of the Charter of good-neighbourly relations, stability, security and cooperation in South-Eastern Europe signed by the participating States of SEECP in Bucharest on 12 February 2000 and the Joint Statement of the Heads of State and Government adopted in Skopje on 25 October 2000".

In the tenth preambular paragraph we have deleted the word "outcome" so that the paragraph would read,

"*Noting further* the Conference on War-Affected Children held in Winnipeg on 17 September 2000".

In operative paragraph 7 the word "bilateral" has been deleted, so that the paragraph will now read,

"*Stresses* the importance of regional efforts aimed at preventing conflicts endangering the maintenance of international peace and security, and *notes* with satisfaction, in this regard, the role of the Multinational Peace Force for South-Eastern Europe".

The adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.47/Rev.1 by the First Committee at this time carries special significance. The third preambular paragraph welcomes the democratic changes in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and their positive effects on the peace, stability and development of South-Eastern Europe. It is the first time that the General Assembly will have formally done so. I am pleased to note that the fundamental democratic

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room C-178. Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum.

00-71829 (E)

changes in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia have resulted in the submission of an application for the admission of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia to the United Nations, an event that will take place today and tomorrow.

I wish to stress that the region of South-Eastern Europe is entering a new period of integration with developed Europe and leaving behind the period of conflict, insecurity and underdevelopment. The adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.47/Rev.1 will strengthen this process. In this new period for our region, disarmament and arms control efforts and efforts to eliminate illegal trafficking in small arms and light weapons I am sure will be more successful than has been the case in the past. The adoption of this draft resolution will mean that the principle of good-neighbourliness and mutual respect will dominate in relations and cooperation among all countries in South-Eastern Europe.

I should like to take this opportunity to thank all sponsors for their sponsorship and for their participation in the preparation of the draft resolution. I should also like to thank all delegations to the First Committee for their support, readiness and willingness to promote the aspirations of South-Eastern European countries, which is very important at this moment.

Mr. Alborzi (Islamic Republic of Iran): I have asked for the floor to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.1/Rev.1, entitled "Missiles".

Since the submission of this draft resolution, my delegation has conducted extensive consultations on its content. Various suggestions and proposals were made during those consultations which were intended to bring new elements to or further elaborate on some of the concepts in the draft. We highly commend all those efforts, and I acknowledge the importance and relevance of the suggestions. The delegation of the Islamic Republic of Iran is aware of the complex nature of the issue of missiles, which, to a certain extent, is difficult to compare with any other field of disarmament and arms regulation because of its sensitivity in the context of the national security of States. Therefore, the presentation of this draft resolution to the General Assembly should be viewed as an agent to build upon the minimum required common denominator among the different approaches involved.

Last year, when we started our efforts to initiate a basis on which to commence multilateral intergovernmental discussions on the issue of missiles, we anticipated that it would not be an easy way to go. We soon further realized that it was much more complex than could be seen at the first stage. All this has brought us to the question of why this significant issue of disarmament and arms control has remained dormant and outside the realm of the United Nations, where it truly belongs.

Our extensive consultations with various countries and groups of countries, both at the United Nations and in capitals, revealed the cold facts that several States occupying a significant position in regional and international peace and security, in particular those with access to technology and those who either maintained or envisaged a system of missiles in their broader military and security strategies, had solidly entrenched positions with little room for flexibility. The arguments raised, we should admit, in most cases were convincingly strong and difficult to disregard. Our delegation, however, was required to work to achieve a basic minimum out of some deeply opposing views throughout the past month and in the course of this session of the General Assembly. We are aware that some countries would still prefer to have their views included.

Some strongly believe that the principle of non-discrimination should be further highlighted and the existing deployments should be taken into account. Others wish to view the draft resolution and the panel of experts as a multilateral means to effectively address the issue of non-proliferation of ballistic missiles. The prevailing view was, however, that neither should be overemphasized at the expense of the other and that both should be maintained as positions of principle through which a reasonable approach could emerge.

Iran is not fully satisfied with the result since it was our desire to accommodate as many views as possible, especially because most of them were also in line with our national position. We are, in the meantime, pleased to have been able to encompass the concerns, at least in a general manner.

The revised text of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.1/Rev.1 contains two new elements which are also the product of our consultations with Member States and with the Secretariat. The first is for the Secretariat to further seek the views of Member States.

That could provide an opportunity for more States to submit their views to the United Nations. It was also suggested that the expert group should submit its report in two years' time instead of one year's time in order to enable the Secretariat to better organize the sessions of the panel. These two issues are duly addressed in the revised text of the draft resolution.

The draft resolution provides a general framework for opening a multilateral dialogue on the issue. The Iranian delegation hopes that the establishment of the panel of governmental experts will receive the highest degree of support from States and the Secretary-General. We are confident that interested countries with decisive views will have an outstanding opportunity to express them to the expert group which is to study the issue of missiles in all its aspects.

The Chairman: If no delegations wish to make general statements or comments on draft resolutions contained in cluster 1, nuclear weapons, the Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.1/Rev.1. I call first on those delegations wishing to explain their position or vote before a decision is taken.

Mr. Cheng Jingye (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): I should like to state China's position on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.1/Rev.1, entitled "Missiles". In recent years the question of missiles has caused increasingly wide concern and requires serious treatment by the international community. We believe that since this question is so complicated and involves so many factors it cannot possibly be effectively addressed through any unilateral approach or measure detrimental to global strategic stability. Discriminatory measures taken by groups cannot fundamentally solve this question either, although they may ease some problems in the short term. We believe that in order to settle this question appropriately it is necessary to promote the establishment of a fair and reasonable new political order, reject the practice of power politics and the abuse of power, and further strengthen regional and international security so that all countries can have a sense of security.

At the same time, it is necessary to establish a universal and non-discriminatory global multilateral mechanism through widespread international dialogue and cooperation, first of all to address the issue of missiles in all its aspects fairly and comprehensively.

We believe that draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.1/Rev.1 represents a constructive effort in this direction. We are in favour of the proposal contained in the draft resolution that a panel of governmental experts be established on the basis of equitable geographical distribution to discuss the question of missiles. Therefore, China will vote in favour of the draft resolution.

Mr. De la Fortelle (France) (*spoke in French*): It is my honour to take the floor on behalf of the European Union. The countries of Central and Eastern Europe associated with the European Union — Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia — and the associated countries Cyprus, Malta and Turkey, as well as Iceland and Norway, as countries of the European Free Trade Association and members of the European Economic Area, associate themselves with this explanation of vote.

The European Union fully acknowledges the importance of the question of non-proliferation of missiles. While understanding the general approach taken by the draft resolution, we find that it is too vague on the critical subject: the proliferation of missiles and missile-related technology. The European Union has therefore decided to abstain in the voting on this draft resolution.

Nevertheless, the European Union emphasizes the need to step up international efforts to prevent the spread of missiles and missile-related technologies. Inter alia, the draft code of conduct recently adopted in Helsinki will have a role to play here. The member States of the European Union therefore hope to participate fully in the panel of experts to be established in order to uphold the principles and objectives that it supports.

Mr. Khairat (Egypt) (*spoke in Arabic*): The delegation of Egypt wishes to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.1/Rev.1, entitled "Missiles", in order to clarify certain points on this issue.

First, Egypt proceeds from the premise that this question must be considered comprehensively within the framework of the consideration of weapons of mass destruction. Secondly, dialogue on missiles must be totally non-discriminatory and take all elements into account without focusing only on aspects of non-discrimination and non-proliferation. Thirdly, we hope that the Iranian draft resolution will be a positive first

step in this dialogue. The content of the draft resolution is positive and contributes to disarmament efforts. Therefore, Egypt will vote in favour of the draft resolution out of our concern to advance disarmament efforts, in particular those aimed at eliminating weapons of mass destruction and their delivery systems.

Mr. Luck (Australia): My delegation has asked for the floor to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.1/Rev.1, on the subject of missiles.

Australia agrees that the issue of missiles warrants international and United Nations attention and welcomes Iran's interest in the matter, as shown by its sponsorship of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/55/L.1/Rev.1. In particular, we note with interest the proposal for the formation of a panel of experts to report to the General Assembly at its fifty-seventh session on missile issues.

Australia has been active in pursuing measures to reduce the proliferation of missiles and looks forward to being able to contribute to these efforts in a range of bodies. Regrettably, however, Australia continues to have a number of substantive difficulties with this draft resolution, which means that we will abstain again this year. These difficulties have more to do with what the draft resolution omits than what it addresses. For example, all States would recognize that the proliferation of ballistic missile technology and the development by more countries of increasingly longer-range ballistic missiles is of grave international concern. Ballistic missile proliferation, and particularly long-range ballistic missile proliferation, destabilizes both regional and global security. Like many others we find it difficult to support a draft resolution on the issue of missiles "in all its aspects" which does not make any mention of the increasing rate of ballistic missile proliferation and the need to address it.

The reference to the need for "a comprehensive approach towards missiles, in a balanced and non-discriminatory manner" could be interpreted as ignoring the valuable contribution made by the missile technology control regime to missile non-proliferation efforts. Australia is a strong supporter of the missile technology control regime, the objective of which is to inhibit and prevent destabilizing transfers of ballistic missile technology.

Finally, to return to the question of a panel of experts, Australia believes that should such a panel be created by this draft resolution, it should concentrate on the issue of analysing and reducing ballistic missile proliferation, in particular of long-range ballistic missiles. The panel would require adequate time to examine the question of missiles, and for that reason we support the timing of reporting to the General Assembly at its fifty-seventh session. We look forward to making a constructive contribution to this exercise should it go ahead.

Mr. Akram (Pakistan): The draft resolution introduced by the representative of Iran on the issue of missiles represents a very important initiative which the Pakistan delegation has strongly supported from the outset. We wish that the draft resolution could have reflected with greater precision and detail some of the factual problems and issues that surround the question of missiles in the present-day context.

First, we had hoped that the draft resolution would acknowledge that the central security danger posed by missiles arises from the existing deployment of thousands of missiles equipped with nuclear weapons by some of the major Powers.

Secondly, we had hoped that concern would be expressed at the unilateral and discriminatory measures that are at present maintained by certain States in the context of missiles. Reference has been made here to the so-called MTCR — Missile Technology Control Regime. Pakistan considers this scheme to be highly discriminatory against the developing countries. States that reserve the right to maintain and deploy thousands of missiles themselves, are now promoting the concept of missile non-proliferation and thus seeking to deny developing countries the legitimate means for self-defence. That is totally unjustified. Unless we oppose discriminatory regimes such as the MTCR, there is likely to be a proliferation, yes, but a proliferation of discrimination.

We hear talk of the emergence of an aircraft technology control regime. Soon we will hear of the emergence of an information technology control regime, and thereafter, no doubt, a regime for the control of brain power will also emerge as a means of further increasing the gap in security between the developed and the developing countries.

The international community must resolutely resist this discriminatory trend, and we hope that in the further work on this issue, the question of discrimination, which has been projected here and

elsewhere as a problem of non-proliferation, connoting the attitude of apartheid in security, will be opposed, at least by the developing countries.

We welcome the opportunity, which the adoption of this draft resolution will present, to open a multilateral dialogue involving all interested States in order to evolve equitable, non-discriminatory and universally accepted agreements and norms on the issue of missiles. We take note that operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.1 states that the panel should include experts on the basis of equitable geographical distribution. We trust that the panel will include experts from all interested States. In the past there was a tendency to invite experts only from countries that voted in favour of resolutions setting up such panels. We note that now some of those countries want to abstain in the voting on this draft resolution but still insist on their membership of the panel that is to be established.

Finally, there is one important concept that does not find adequate reflection in the draft resolution, and that is the need to promote the peaceful uses of the technologies involved. In our world today some countries have the power to reach outer space while others are not even allowed to use firecrackers. This situation must change, and we hope that this draft resolution and the expert discussion that it will initiate will allow the evolution of greater equity in the field of missiles.

The Chairman: The Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.1/Rev.1.

A recorded vote has been requested.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Lin Kuo-chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.1/Rev.1, entitled "Missiles", was introduced by the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran at the Committee's 26th meeting, on 31 October 2000.

In connection with draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.1/Rev.1, "Missiles", I wish to put on record the following statement on financial implications, on behalf of the Secretary-General:

> "By operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.1/Rev.1, the General Assembly would request the Secretary-General, with the assistance of a panel of governmental experts, to be established in 2001 on the basis of equitable geographical distribution, to prepare a report for the consideration of the General Assembly at its fifty-seventh session on the issue of missiles in all its aspects.
>
> "It is envisaged that the panel of experts would hold its sessions in New York according to the following schedule: one session in 2001, two sessions in 2002. The conference-servicing requirements at full cost are estimated to be US$ 91,900 in 2001.
>
> "With regard to sessions to be held in 2001, the extent to which the Organization's capacity would need to be supplemented by temporary assistance resources can be determined only in the light of the calendar of conferences and meetings for the biennium 2000-2001. However, provision is made under section 2, "General Assembly affairs and conference services", of the programme budget for the biennium 2000-2001, not only for meetings programmed at the time of budget preparation but also for meetings authorized subsequently, provided that the number and distribution of meetings is consistent with the pattern of meetings of past years. Consequently, should the General Assembly adopt the draft resolution in question, no additional appropriation would be required for conference servicing in the biennium 2000-2001.
>
> "The conference-servicing requirements for the sessions to be held in 2002 would be considered in the context of the preparation of the Secretary-General's proposed programme budget for the biennium 2002-2003. Provisions have been made under section 4, "Disarmament", of the programme budget for the 2000-2001 biennium which would allow the Department for Disarmament Affairs to provide the necessary substantive services to the session of the proposed panel of experts to be held in New York in 2001.
>
> "Therefore, should the General Assembly adopt draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.1/Rev.1, no additional requirements would arise under the programme budget for the biennium 2000-2001."

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Thailand, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Andorra, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belgium, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Lebanon, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Paraguay, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Samoa, San Marino, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay

Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.1/Rev.1 was adopted by 90 votes to none, with 60 abstentions.

The Chairman: I shall now call on those delegations wishing to explain their votes or positions on the draft resolution just adopted.

Mr. Grey (United States of America): The United States understands the sentiment behind the draft resolution but continues to believe that it is unnecessary and counter-productive to bring this discussion into the United Nations. Accordingly, the United States abstained.

The problems of missile proliferation are well known, and ongoing international efforts already exist to limit missile proliferation. The call for a different multinational approach is unnecessary and counter-productive. The responses received by the Secretary-General thus far do not indicate that there is sufficient agreement in the international community to merit convening a panel of experts. Until more States respond, and until the specific views of the international community become clearer, a panel of experts could do more harm than good. The United States Government takes this view not because we believe there is no problem with missile proliferation. Quite the contrary: the United States takes the danger of missile proliferation very seriously and has been an active participant in seeking to limit it. In practice, the international community's most effective efforts have been on a regional basis and involve the States directly interested and affected. The United States plans to continue its efforts to address the problems posed by missile proliferation and will focus on strengthening and reinforcing those efforts. We encourage other concerned States to cooperate in this common cause and not to act in ways that would undermine it or divert attention and resources from it.

Mr. Noboru (Japan): I have asked for the floor to explain the position of my Government on the draft resolution on missiles, contained in document A/C.1/55/L.1/Rev.1.

The proliferation of missiles as delivery vehicles for weapons of mass destruction is a matter of concern to Japan, which, for its part, has been making efforts for the non-proliferation of these missiles. My delegation, however, abstained in the voting on this draft resolution since it does not make explicit reference either to the concern about the proliferation of missiles as delivery vehicles for weapons of mass destruction or to recognition of the efforts being made in which my country participates. Regardless of how

we vote, we remain committed to the goal of the non-proliferation of such missiles and to playing an active role in preventing and curbing their proliferation.

Mr. Chang (Republic of Korea): My delegation wishes to explain its abstention in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.1/Rev.1. The proliferation of missiles as a means to deliver weapons of mass destruction seriously undermines international peace and security. In particular, the test firings conducted in some regions over recent years have provided an urgent reason for the international community to address the issue of the proliferation of ballistic missiles. Given the complexities inherent in this issue, we believe that a step-by-step approach would be most practical. We note that the international community has made various efforts to resolve this issue at the bilateral and multilateral levels, and we encourage their further development. My delegation, however, is of the view that this draft resolution fails to address these points properly. Therefore, my delegation abstained.

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.19/Rev.1. I call first on those delegations wishing to explain their position or vote before a decision is taken on the draft resolution.

Mr. Kim Won Myong (Democratic People's Republic of Korea): The delegation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea would like to express its views on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.19/Rev.1.

The Treaties of Tlatelolco, Rarotonga, Bangkok and Pelindaba, establishing nuclear-weapon-free zones that cover the southern hemisphere, contribute to a great extent to a nuclear-weapon-free world. The Democratic People's Republic of Korea highly values these achievements and appreciates the efforts made by the countries of the regions concerned. We agree that it is imperative to ensure in practical terms and further consolidate the legal status of these nuclear-weapon-free zones by fully meeting the request and desire of countries in those regions. We do not see any reason, in view of the commitment made by the nuclear-weapon States concerned, for the request of the countries not to be met. It is also hoped that such nuclear-weapon-free zones will be expanded to other regions.

Ms. Menéndez (Spain) (*spoke in Spanish*): My delegation is taking the floor in order to explain its vote before the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.19/Rev.1, entitled "Nuclear-weapon-free southern hemisphere and adjacent areas". My delegation intends to abstain in the voting.

Spain fully supports the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones on the basis of arrangements freely arrived at among the States of the region concerned. It is our view, in this respect, that the draft resolution before us, "Nuclear-weapon-free southern hemisphere and adjacent areas", is important for the consolidation of such zones and cooperation among them. In the past my delegation supported the content of such resolutions, casting a vote in favour in 1998 and 1999. This time, however, because of the incorporation of a new operative paragraph 6, on the content of which we have reservations, my delegation will abstain in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.19/Rev.1.

Resolution 53/77 Q of 1998, resolution 54/54 L of 1999 and draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.19/Rev.1 contain in their preambular paragraphs reference to the possibility of, among other types of exchanges, joint meetings of States parties and signatories to treaties establishing nuclear-weapon-free zones, the objective being that of fostering cooperation among such areas. My delegation has no objection to that concept. However, the text to be put to the vote this year introduces a qualitatively different new concept in operative paragraph 6 — that of a possible international conference — and this also entails, in our view, a departure from the consensuses recently reached with regard to nuclear-weapon-free zones. Indeed, the concept of a possible international conference such as that outlined in operative paragraph 6 has not been mentioned at any previous time — not in the report submitted by the Disarmament Commission in April 1999 on the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones on the basis of arrangements freely arrived at among the States of the region concerned, and not in the paragraphs on nuclear-weapon-free zones in the Final Document of the 2000 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

Spain actively participated in both negotiations and welcomes the fact that in both, satisfactory consensus outcomes were arrived at, although with difficulty. It is our view that the groundwork we have laid in both documents is adequate and further juridical or political elements that might warrant holding the kind of international conference that is being proposed in operative paragraph 6 are not needed. Therefore, my delegation finds itself unable to endorse such a

proposal and is consequently unable to support this draft resolution.

Mr. Sorreta (Philippines): The Philippines wishes to explain its vote before the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.19/Rev.1. The Philippines will vote in favour of the draft resolution because it contains elements that the Philippines feels are very worthy of our support. The Philippines was among those who strongly supported and co-sponsored such a resolution when it first came out, during the fifty-first session. However, subsequent versions of the resolution have included language that refers to a right of a passage through maritime space, forcing the Philippines to withdraw its co-sponsorship of the draft resolution.

In the context of a nuclear-weapon-free southern hemisphere the language on freedom of passage could only refer to the passage of ships carrying nuclear weapons through the high seas and maritime space. The Philippines understands and appreciates that this language was included because of the desire of the principal proponent of the draft resolution to gather more support. However, this language does not and will not contribute to the realization of the objectives of this draft resolution, and will in the long run prove to make that realization even more difficult. Just as we believe that States cannot transport weapons of mass destruction through the high seas and maritime space, the Philippines believes that nuclear weapons should be treated no differently. In our written and oral pleadings during the hearings on the advisory opinion on the *Legality of the Threat or Use of Nuclear Weapons* we emphasized our belief that nuclear weapons are illegal, wherever they may be. We reiterated that position when we sought to include nuclear weapons, which are clearly indiscriminate and cause unnecessary harm and suffering, as a prohibited weapon in the Statute of the International Criminal Court. For the Philippines, which is composed of quite a lot of maritime space, this prohibition finds form and substance in our Constitution, which does not allow the presence of nuclear weapons on our lands or in our maritime space.

Political realities have conjured up the legal fiction of the non-illegality of nuclear weapons. Those political realities are changing and hopefully will lead to the absence of nuclear weapons in both hemispheres.

Mr. Soutar (United Kingdom): I have asked for the floor on behalf of France, the United States and the United Kingdom to explain our position on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.19/Rev.1, on the so-called nuclear-weapon-free southern hemisphere and adjacent areas. Our three delegations will again vote against this draft resolution. Last year we worked hard with the sponsors of the resolution in an ultimately futile attempt to allay our concerns about their seeming desire to restrict maritime rights of free passage on the high seas. Unfortunately, the sponsors refused to include in the draft resolution the applicable passages of the Convention on the Law of the Sea, as well as explicit reassurance that the fundamental freedom of the seas was to be unaffected by their intentions.

Our concerns have increased this year. A Minister from one of the sponsor countries has made it clear that it is his intention precisely to limit freedom of the high seas in ways that fundamentally undermine the norms set by the Convention on the Law of the Sea. We are also concerned by the new language in this year's draft resolution referring to an international conference of States parties and signatories to nuclear-weapon-free zones. It is not clear what that conference is meant to achieve, and under the circumstances I have already described we can only fear the worst. The United Nations, moreover, agreed on general guidelines for nuclear-weapon-free zones at the United Nations Disarmament Commission session of 1999, and we do not see how this conference can contribute anything further.

Lastly, without any clear intention of the purpose of the international conference and how it is meant to relate to the relevant legal instruments and accepted international norms, it appears to us as if the sponsors were on an exploratory expedition that may well be unhelpful to our overall interests. We should all consider the consequences carefully.

The Chairman: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.19/Rev.1. A separate vote on the last three words of operative paragraph 3 has been requested, and a separate vote on operative paragraph 3 has been requested.

There will therefore be three steps to the voting. First, the Committee will vote on the last three words of operative paragraph 3 of A/C.1/55/L.19/Rev.1. Secondly, the Committee will vote on operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.19/Rev.1. Finally, the Committee will vote on A/C.1/55/L.19/Rev.1 as a whole.

The Committee will now take a decision on the last three words of operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.19/Rev.1. A recorded vote has been requested.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Lin Kuo-chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.19/Rev.1, entitled "Nuclear-weapon-free southern hemisphere and adjacent areas", was introduced by the representative of Brazil at the Committee's 25th meeting, on 30 October 2000. The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.19/Rev.1 are listed in the draft resolution itself. In addition, Ghana has become a sponsor of the draft resolution.

The Committee will now vote on the last three words of operative paragraph 3, which read "and South Asia".

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

India

Abstaining:

Bhutan, Cuba, Cyprus, Israel, Mauritius, Micronesia (Federated States of), Myanmar, Pakistan, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

The last three words of operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.19/Rev.1 were retained by 134 votes to 1, with 10 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegation of Botswana informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.]

The Chairman: The Committee will now take a decision on operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.19/Rev.1. A recorded vote has been requested.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Lin Kuo-chung (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now proceed to vote on operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.19/Rev.1, which reads as follows:

"3. *Welcomes* the steps taken to conclude further nuclear-weapon-free zone treaties on the basis of arrangements freely arrived at among the States of the region concerned, and calls upon all States to consider all relevant proposals, including those reflected in its resolutions on the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in the Middle East and South Asia".

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cambodia,

Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

India

Abstaining:

Bhutan, Cyprus, Israel, Mauritius, Micronesia (Federated States of) Myanmar, Pakistan, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.19/Rev.1 was retained by 138 votes to 1, with 9 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegation of Botswana informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.]

The Chairman: The Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.19/Rev.1 as a whole. A recorded vote has been requested.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Lin Kuo-chung (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now proceed to vote on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.19/Rev.1 as a whole.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

France, Monaco, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Andorra, India, Israel, Micronesia (Federated States of), Russian Federation, Spain

Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.19/Rev.1 as a whole was adopted by 146 votes to 4, with 6 abstentions.

The Chairman: I call now on those delegations wishing to explain their positions or votes.

Mr. Mukul (India): My delegation has asked for the floor to explain its vote with regard to operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.19/Rev.1, entitled "Nuclear-weapon-free southern hemisphere and adjacent areas", which refers to the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia. This proposal goes contrary to a well-established principle regarding the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zone: that these zones must be established on the basis of arrangements freely arrived at among the States of the region concerned. The United Nations Disarmament Commission last year reaffirmed this principle by consensus. There is thus a contradiction in operative paragraph 3.

That contradiction becomes even more apparent when the reference to a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia is seen in the context of current realities. In fact, if the sponsors of this draft resolution wish to maintain any semblance of relationship to reality, the draft resolution should explore ways and means of relating nuclear-weapon-free zones in the southern hemisphere to the new realities in South Asia.

India will be responsive to the expressed need for commitments from these nuclear-weapon-free zones. As we have stated in the past, the proposal for a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia has as much validity as proposals for nuclear-weapon-free zones in East Asia, Western Europe, or North America. Given the distortions and contradictions in operative paragraph 3, we voted against the paragraph while abstaining in the voting on the draft resolution as a whole.

Mr. Cheng Jingye (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): China is always in favour of and supports the efforts to establish nuclear-weapon-free zones on the basis of arrangements freely arrived at among the States of the region concerned. On the basis of this position, China has signed and ratified the relevant protocols to nuclear-weapon-free zone treaties for Latin America, Africa and the South Pacific, and to the Antarctic Treaty. China is willing to sign as early as possible the revised protocol to the South-East Asia Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone Treaty in accordance with the programme agreed by South-East Asian countries. China believes that the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones is of great significance for the promotion of nuclear disarmament, nuclear non-proliferation and the enhancement of world and regional peace and security. At the same time, nuclear-weapon-free zones should be established in accordance with the provisions and principles of the United Nations Charter and the universally acknowledged principles of international law.

The scope of a nuclear-weapon-free zone should not include continental shelves and exclusive economic zones, nor should it include areas in which there are disputes over territorial sovereignty and maritime rights and interests with countries outside the zone. The participants in a nuclear-weapon-free zone should not use any pretext, including a relationship with a military alliance, to avoid fulfilling their relevant obligations.

The Chinese delegation has noticed that the draft resolution just adopted on a nuclear-weapon-free southern hemisphere and adjacent areas refers to the applicable principles and rules of international law relating to the freedom of the high seas and the right of passage through maritime space, including those of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea. It is our understanding that the draft resolution does not seek to add any new legal obligation to those contained in the relevant nuclear-weapon-free zone treaties. On the basis of this position and this understanding, my delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution.

Mr. Thapa (Nepal): My delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.19/Rev.1, entitled "Nuclear-weapon-free southern hemisphere and adjacent areas". My delegation's conviction is that the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones contributes positively to the goals of nuclear disarmament. They are effective confidence-building measures. That is why my delegation considers that the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in any part of the world could be helpful. That is why it also welcomed the opportunity to include the last three words of operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution.

The Chairman: The Committee will now turn to cluster 2. I call first on those delegations wishing to make general statements or comments on draft resolutions contained in cluster 2, other weapons of mass destruction.

Mr. De la Fortelle (France) (*spoke in French*): It is my honour to take the floor on behalf of the European Union regarding draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.42, entitled "Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction". The countries of Eastern and Central Europe associated with the European Union — Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia — and the associated countries of Cyprus, Malta and Turkey, as well as Iceland, a European Free Trade Association country and member of the European Economic Area, associate themselves with this statement. The members of the European Union fully support draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.42 put forward by Hungary.

The European Union attaches high priority to the strengthening of the 1972 Convention on the prohibition of biological and toxin weapons. The fulfilment of that objective depends on the conclusion of negotiations within the special group of parties to the Convention on a legally binding protocol establishing a regime of verification and control. The European Union is continuing its efforts to advance the successful outcome of those negotiations so that the protocol can be adopted as soon as possible by a special conference of parties to the Convention to be held before the Fifth Review Conference of the Convention. The European Union invites all States parties to become involved in these efforts.

The member States of the European Union are actively participating in the negotiations of the special group. They reaffirmed their continuing commitment by establishing on 17 May 1999 a common position regarding the progress to be made in order to conclude the protocol. The measures contained in that common position are designed to provide a balance between the needs of verification and respect for the economic and commercial interests of States parties. In terms of security, they can provide significant guarantees, which today are lacking. The European Union believes that the establishment of a regime of verification and control for the 1972 Convention, made possible through the adoption of the protocol in 2001, will soon be added to the steps made in the past 10 years in the area of nuclear, chemical and conventional disarmament.

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.42. If no delegations wish to explain their position or vote before a decision is taken, the Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.42.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Lin Kuo-chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.42, entitled "Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction", was introduced by the representative of Hungary at the Committee's 18th meeting, on 19 October 2000. The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.42 are listed in the draft resolution itself and in document A/C.1/55/INF.2. In addition, the following countries have become sponsors: Cuba and the Islamic Republic of Iran.

The programme budget implications for the draft resolution are contained in document A/C.1/55/L.54, "Note by the Secretariat concerning the responsibilities entrusted to the Secretary-General under draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.42".

The Chairman: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.42 have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.42 was adopted.

The Chairman: If no delegations wish to explain their position on the draft resolution just adopted, we shall turn now to cluster 4. I call first on delegations wishing to make general statements or comments on draft resolutions contained in cluster 4, conventional weapons.

Mr. Sorreta (Philippines): The Philippines places the highest importance on the small arms conference to be held next year, and we are very glad that at this point we know where and when it will be held. For this we wish to express our appreciation for the efforts of the delegation of Japan for allowing us to arrive at this

point and also express our appreciation to the many delegations that cooperated so that we could arrive at this decision. We must also recognize the very generous offer of Switzerland. We know the extent to which it has been helping with the small arms problem, and it has taken the extra step of wanting to host the conference.

As an affected country, the Philippines looks forward to the conference and hopes other issues, such as the chairmanship and the participation of non-governmental organizations, can be resolved by a process that will not affect the two forthcoming preparatory committee meetings, because our preference is that the Preparatory Committee meetings should deal with the substantive issues, and issues such as the chairmanship and the participation of non-governmental organizations could be dealt with positively in an inter-sessional informal way.

Mr. De la Fortelle (France) (*spoke in French*): I should like, on behalf of the European Union, to make the following statement regarding draft decision A/C.1/55/L.28/Rev.1. The countries of Eastern and Central Europe associated with the European Union — Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia — and the associated countries of Cyprus, Malta and Turkey, as well as Norway and Iceland as European Free Trade Association countries members of the European Economic Area, associate themselves with this declaration.

The European Union welcomes the offer made by the Government of Switzerland to hold the 2001 Conference on the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects in Geneva. In particular, we welcome the willingness of the Swiss Government to allow, thanks to generous funding, the participation of the greatest possible number of delegations, in particular experts from those countries most affected by the problem of the destabilizing accumulation of small arms. We keenly regret that a few days ago the Swiss authorities were obliged to withdraw their offer, given the impossibility of finding a basis for reasonable agreement with the Secretariat in order to define the supplementary costs resulting from the holding of the United Nations Conference in Geneva. The European Union remains convinced that for the future Geneva must be able to remain a United Nations focal point for disarmament. It will strive to ensure that that status is recognized with all due clarity and transparency.

The European Union hopes that procedural issues will be settled as quickly as possible, and by consensus, in order to continue preparations for the 2001 Conference in the best spirit possible. Today we finally need to turn to issues of substance with the preparation of an international plan of action commensurate with what is now at stake. Let us not forget that the 2001 Conference — and we are gratified that it is able to be held next July — is an important meeting for the international community, in particular for all those suffering from this scourge. The meeting in January of the Preparatory Committee will provide an opportunity to show our capacity to meet their expectations, and, as far as members of the European Union are concerned, we shall give Chairman Carlos Dos Santos all the assistance that he has a right to expect from delegations.

The Chairman: If no delegations wish to explain their position or vote before a decision is taken, the Committee will now take action on draft decision A/C.1/55/L.28/Rev.1.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Lin Kuo-chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft decision A/C.1/55/L.28/Rev.1, entitled "Small arms", was introduced by the representative of Japan at the Committee's 25th meeting, on 30 October 2000. The sponsors of draft decision A/C.1/55/L.28/Rev.1 are listed in the draft decision itself and in document A/C.1/55/INF.2. In addition, the following countries have become sponsors of the draft decision: Austria, Brazil, Guinea, Mozambique, Senegal and Uzbekistan.

I wish to make a statement on the conference service implications of draft decision A/C.1/55/L.28/Rev.1. Under the terms of operative paragraph 14 of resolution 54/54 V, which is referred to in the preambular paragraph of draft decision A/C.1/55/L.28/Rev.1, the General Assembly requested the Secretary-General to carry out a study, with the assistance of governmental experts appointed by him, on the feasibility of restricting the manufacture of and trade in small arms and light weapons. It is envisaged that in 2001 the Group of Governmental Experts on the feasibility study of small arms, will hold a one-week meeting in New York early next year, tentatively from 12 to 16 February 2001.

There will be two meetings per day, a total of 10 meetings, with interpretation service in all six languages Documentation requirements are estimated at 70 pages in session and 40 pages post-session to be processed in six languages. The conference-servicing requirements at full cost are estimated at US$ 193,500 in 2001. The extent to which the Organization's capacity would need to be supplemented by temporary assistance resources can be determined only in the light of the calendar of conferences and meetings for the biennium 2000-2001. However, provision is made under section 2, "General Assembly affairs and conference services", of the programme budget for the biennium 2000-2001 not only for meetings programmed at the time of budget preparation, but also for meetings authorized subsequently, provided that the number and distribution of meetings is consistent with the pattern of meetings of past years. Consequently, should the General Assembly adopt the draft decision in question, no additional appropriation would be required for conference servicing in the biennium 2000-2001.

The Chairman: The sponsors of draft decision A/C.1/55/L.28/Rev.1 have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft decision A/C.1/55/L.28/Rev.1 was adopted.

The Chairman: If no delegations wish to explain their position on the draft decision just adopted, the Committee will now move to cluster 10. If no delegations wish to make general statements or comments on draft resolutions contained in cluster 10, international security, the Committee will proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.47/Rev.1.

If no delegations wish to explain their vote or position on the draft resolution before action is taken, the Committee will take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.47/Rev.1.

A recorded vote has been requested.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Lin Kuo-chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.47/Rev.1, entitled "Maintenance of international security, good-neighbourliness, stability and development of South-Eastern Europe", was introduced by the representative of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia at the Committee's 26th meeting, on 31 October 2000. The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.47/Rev.1 are listed in the draft resolution itself and in document A/C.1/55/INF.2. In addition, the following countries have become sponsors of the draft resolution: Iceland and Turkey.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:
None

Abstaining:
None

Draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.47/Rev.1 was adopted by 150 votes to none.

The Chairman: I now call on those delegations wishing to explain their votes or positions on the draft resolution just adopted.

Mr. Reznikov (Belarus) (*spoke in Russian*): The delegation of Belarus has asked for the floor in order to explain its position and its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.47/Rev.1, entitled "Maintenance of international security, good-neighbourliness, stability and development in South-Eastern Europe".

Our delegation considers this draft to be an unquestionably important example of regional cooperation that reflects the efforts of countries for the development of good-neighbourliness, stability and the development of South-Eastern Europe. But is the subject of the draft resolution within the competence of the First Committee? It is known that in plenary meetings the General Assembly takes decisions on such agenda items in the context of the establishment of long-lasting, stable peace and progress in freedom and democracy in regions such as Central America; of the reasons for conflict and ways to promote and ensure lasting peace and stable development in Africa; and of the establishment of a zone of peace and cooperation in the South Atlantic.

Those are but a few of the agenda items discussed in plenary meetings of the General Assembly that have always found support from our delegation. This draft resolution, in our view, should be considered in the plenary General Assembly. Unquestionably, it contains a number of provisions that touch on questions of disarmament, but that is not its main thrust. We consider, therefore, that it is a more appropriate subject for the plenary Assembly than for the First Committee.

In addition, the draft resolution contains a number of provisions that are a source of concern to my delegation. We reported on this to the sponsors of the draft resolution and expressed our concern well before even the first version of the draft resolution was issued officially, let alone the revised draft resolution. Nevertheless, after revision 1 was issued we saw that none of our views and concerns had been taken into account. Therefore, our delegation maintains certain reservations on the text of the draft and cannot join the consensus on adopting the draft resolution. However, taking into account the constructive and cooperative spirit at this session, and also in the light of the generally positive thrust of the draft resolution, our delegation did not insist on a vote.

Mr. Benítez Verson (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): The Cuban delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.47/Rev.1, mindful of its relevance to efforts being made to promote good-neighbourliness, stability and development in South-Eastern Europe.

Cuba particularly supports the principles to which reference is made in operative paragraphs 4, 5 and 6 of the draft resolution. That does not mean any automatic endorsement by Cuba of each and every one of the elements and approaches embodied in this text. In fact, the draft resolution raises certain issues that, in our view, would require broader consideration than the consideration we in the First Committee could give to them. Among these issues we find, for instance, some that bear on the work done by the United Nations and by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization in Kosovo. If there is a continuing trend to incorporate in draft resolutions on this subject new elements with broad implications, we would suggest that in future the main sponsors of the draft resolutions consider the possibility that the texts be considered in the plenary General Assembly and not within the First Committee. That would make it possible in turn to consider each and every one of these elements from a far broader and more comprehensive perspective.

The Chairman: The statement of the representative of Botswana has been noted.

Before adjourning the meeting I should like to remind representatives once again that, bearing in mind our aim to finish the work of the Committee, tomorrow, Wednesday, 1 November 2000, there will be only two more meetings in which to act upon the remaining draft resolutions. Tomorrow will be the final day for taking action on the remaining draft resolutions. I therefore urge delegations, particularly the sponsors of the remaining draft resolutions, to get them ready and inform the Secretariat in a timely manner so that the Committee will be able to take action on them on schedule.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Lin Kuo-chung (Secretary of the Committee): I should like to draw the attention of the members of the Committee to the fact that the note by the Secretariat concerning the responsibilities entrusted to the Secretary-General under draft resolution A/C.1/55/L.50 is contained in document A/C.1/55/L.55, which has been distributed today.

The meeting rose at 12.10 p.m.